

Moral Education for Women in the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters

Philosophers of the Household

Annette Bourland Huizenga

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM 147

BRILL

Moral Education for Women in
the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

Executive Editors

M. M. Mitchell

Chicago

D. P. Moessner

Texas

Editorial Board

L. ALEXANDER, SHEFFIELD – H.W. ATTRIDGE, NEW HAVEN

F. BOVON, CAMBRIDGE MA – C. BREYTENBACH, BERLIN

J. K. ELLIOTT, LEEDS – C. R. HOLLADAY, ATLANTA

M. J. J. MENKEN, TILBURG – J. C. THOM, STELLENBOSCH

P. TREBILCO, DUNEDIN

VOLUME 147

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/nts

Moral Education for Women in the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters

Philosophers of the Household

By

Annette Bourland Huizenga



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Huizenga, Annette Bourland.

Moral education for women in the pastoral and Pythagorean letters : philosophers of the household / by Annette Bourland Huizenga.

pages cm. – (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; VOLUME 147)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-24499-3 (alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-24518-1 (e-book)

1. Women—Conduct of life. 2. Christian women—Conduct of life. 3. Ancient philosophy. 4. Bible. N.T. Pastoral epistles—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

BJ1610.H78 2013

170.82—dc23

2012047370

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 978-90-04-24499-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-24518-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Brill has made all reasonable efforts to trace all rights holders to any copyrighted material used in this work. In cases where these efforts have not been successful the publisher welcomes communications from copyrights holders, so that the appropriate acknowledgements can be made in future editions, and to settle other permission matters.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

List of Tables	VII
Acknowledgements.....	IX
Introduction	1

PART ONE

THE PYTHAGOREAN WOMEN'S LETTERS

I The Pythagorean Letter Collection.....	31
II Female Pythagorean Teachers	77
III Teaching Strategies.....	129
IV Topics for Women.....	169
Conclusion to Part One: The Good Woman <i>Topos</i>	201

PART TWO

THE PASTORAL LETTERS

V The Pastorals Letter Collection.....	221
VI Teachers And Learners.....	257
VII Teaching Strategies.....	289
VIII Topics for Women.....	329
Conclusion	365
Appendix A Greek Text of Pythagorean Letters.....	377
Appendix B Translated Selections from The Pastorals.....	384
Bibliography	395
Index of Ancient Sources Cited	409
Index of Modern Authors	428
Index of Subjects	432

LIST OF TABLES

A	Pythagorean letter collection	33
B	Qualifications for a wet-nurse	136
C	Virtues and vices	306

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, which was approved by the faculty of the University of Chicago Divinity School in winter 2010. I am very grateful to the editors of the *Novum Testamentum Supplements Series*, Margaret M. Mitchell and David P. Moessner, along with Harry W. Attridge and the anonymous reader, for accepting it for publication. I also thank the editorial and production staffs at Brill, especially Loes Schouten and Mattie Kuiper, for kindly guiding me through the publishing process.

My interest in the Pastorals corpus as the object for study was first stimulated in the spring of 2000, during a course taught by Margaret M. Mitchell. A gifted teacher, her energetic creativity in the classroom and thorough knowledge of the field continue to inspire and challenge me. As my advisor, she soon became the most attentive and enthusiastic reader of my writing, and I thank her profoundly for encouraging me to persevere in untangling the threads of this complicated project. My deep gratitude also extends to the readers of the dissertation: to Hans-Josef Klauck, especially for his careful and comprehensive teaching, and invaluable scholarly networking; and to Johan C. Thom, in particular for his important work on Pythagorean texts, and for many supportive comments during the writing process.

I have taken a lengthy academic journey on the way to this monograph. The faculty at McCormick Theological Seminary, where I obtained the MATS degree in 1999 deserves special mention. It was at McCormick that I began to explore the possibility of doctoral work, and in that decision I was encouraged by biblical scholars Robert L. Brawley, Theodore Hiebert, Margaret M. Mitchell, Sarah Tanzer, and David Esterline. Many thanks to you all.

The dissertation was finished during my first two years as a faculty member at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary, and my colleagues there proved incredibly helpful and sympathetic toward that project. It is so satisfying to work with such a caring and collegial group of scholars, and especially those in the Bible Division. My thanks to David P. Moessner, for his kind assistance in advancing my work; to Lyle D. VanderBroek, for his encouragement as I adjusted to a new position; to Melinda Thompson, for proof-reading and sympathetic listening; to Amanda Benckhuysen and Matthew R. Schlimm, for numerous agreeable conversations as we walked the dissertation path together.

In the spring of 2006, I was surprised and delighted to learn that I would receive the generous support for one year of dissertation writing from the American Association of University Women. It was a great honor to be selected as a 2006–2007 American Fellowship by this notable organization which seeks to further the influence of women throughout academia. It has been my distinct pleasure to attend meetings of several AAUW chapters to explain my research and findings because the members are so actively engaged in their own lifelong learning. I once again thank the AAUW for this fellowship and for this communal endorsement of my project.

To my families (Bourlands and Huizengas), my friends, and members of LaSalle Street Church-Chicago, I am completely indebted for the affirmation and encouragement they have given me as I wrote and rewrote. My parents, Orley and Peg, wakened in me a great joy for learning and taught me the benefits of education for oneself as well as for the service of others. My children, Benjamin and Meg, showed a willing acceptance of this alteration in my life, even as their own lives underwent momentous changes through adolescence and young adulthood. My husband, Tim, daily demonstrated his commitment to me, first, by keeping his own job so that I could pursue a new work, and second, by expressing his firm belief that I would indeed finish the uncommon course I had begun. Truly, I can never thank him enough for his faithful presence and continuing love.

INTRODUCTION

WOMEN AND ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY

“Can women cultivate moral excellence?” “Who is a good woman?” “What makes her good?”¹ Many early philosophical, ethical, and religious texts consider such questions about women’s morality. Throughout this long-standing discussion, descriptions of women’s “goodness” are linked to their biological sex; that is, compared with men, women are held to different moral standards. Stated more succinctly: goodness has been *gendered*.² The “good” woman is one who demonstrates “womanly” characteristics, “feminine” appearance, and/or behavior “appropriate” to her sex.

The gender perspective of ancient authors presumes that one central and noteworthy characteristic of humankind is that it consists of two sexes.³ L.D. Derksen concludes:

I am prepared to admit that the philosophical dialogue on women was never an extensive part of philosophical systems but, almost without exception, philosophers did speak about women For many philosophers, a view of women was part and parcel of a view on human nature and society. If we ask the question “What is man?” we must consider the nature and significance of the male-female distinction.⁴

¹ A similar question is asked in Prov 31:10: “A brave woman who can find?” (LXX: Γυναίκα ἀνδρείαν τίς εὕρησει;).

² I use “sex” to denote a person’s biology, either female or male (realizing that even these are not always distinct categories themselves). The noun/verb “gender” will refer to (creating) social constructions or expectations of a person based on their sex; the terms “masculine” and “feminine” are synonyms for these gender-differentiations based on one’s sex.

³ In ancient medical as well as philosophical texts, there was significant speculation about male-female biological differences, especially in human reproduction, and how these “natural” differences might lead to differences in rationality and morality. See especially Aristotle, *Generation of Animals*, and, for example, the physician Galen who adopted many of Aristotle’s ideas for his works (e.g., *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*).

⁴ *Dialogues on Women: Images of Women in the History of Philosophy* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1996), ix. While Derksen’s book is extremely helpful in pulling together philosophical ideas about women, she does not provide translations or analyses of the texts and their history. Questions about the differences between men and women continue to resonate within twenty-first century Western societies. As one example, whether women have a different *moral* reasoning process than men is the subject of Carol Gilligan’s widely-read volume *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982; 1993).

The perceived gender difference between female and male is recorded very early in philosophical discourse, and has continued to influence the history of Western thought, so that Derksen observes:

Even questions which do not at first glance seem to concern the male-female distinction, such as: what is the nature and scope of reason and emotions? the ultimate nature of reality itself? are connected to male and female by some philosophers. The masculine and the feminine have been used as allegorical or symbolical representations of human capacities and aspects of reality.⁵

This widespread interest in gender means that it is even instructive to ask what students Socrates has in mind when he appeals to the Athenians to take up philosophy:

Men of Athens, I respect you and love you, but I shall obey the god rather than you, and while I live and am able to continue, I shall never give up philosophy or stop exhorting you and pointing out the truth to anyone of you whom I may meet, saying in my accustomed way, “Most excellent man, are you who are a citizen of Athens, the greatest of cities and the most famous for wisdom and power, not ashamed to care for the acquisition of wealth, and for reputation and honor, when you neither care nor take thought for wisdom and truth and the perfection of your soul?”⁶

Socrates’ speech is plainly addressed to the “*men* of Athens.”⁷ But did he mean to include or exclude women as practitioners of his philosophical art? How do female nature and ethical capacities compare to those of males? Is there a different philosophical way of life for women, and if so, what would it look like? Socrates does not answer these questions in the *Apologia*. Nonetheless, the nature, roles, and virtue of “woman” continue as subjects of classical philosophical inquiry among the mostly male authors.⁸

⁵ *Dialogues*, ix.

⁶ ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀσπάζομαι μὲν καὶ φιλῶ, πείσομαι δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ θεῷ ἢ ὑμῖν, καὶ ἕωσπερ ἂν ἐμπνέω καὶ οἶός τε ὦ, οὐ μὴ παύσωμαι φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ὑμῖν παρακαλευόμενός τε καὶ ἐνδεικνύμενος ὅτῳ ἂν αἰ ἐντυχράνω ὑμῶν, λέγων διάπερ εἴωθα, ὅτι ὦ ἄριστε ἀνδρῶν, Ἀθηναῖος ὢν, πόλεως τῆς μεγίστης καὶ εὐδοκιμωτάτης εἰς σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχύϊν, χρημάτων μὲν οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ ἐπιμελούμενος ὅπως σοι ἔσται ὥς πλείστα, καὶ δόξης καὶ τιμῆς, φρονήσεως δὲ καὶ ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ὅπως ὥς βελτίστη ἔσται οὐκ ἐπιμελῇ οὐδὲ φροντίζεις; *Apol.* 29d–e; LCL; trans. H.N. Fowler.

⁷ The Greek “men” here is the adult male, ἄνδρες, not the possibly more inclusive ἄνθρωποι. The other terms are similarly marked as masculine in gender. The emphasis on (male) “citizens” apparently excludes slaves of either sex from the philosophical life.

⁸ Note here that I am referring to “woman” as a topic of philosophical writing; the “real women” who inhabited the “real world” of these philosophers may or may not have corresponded with the representations devised by these thinkers. In the Roman world, there were many subtle status distinctions between women: there were slave women (working in urban household or rural estates), women who owned slaves, freed women, freeborn

These inquiries into “woman” do not consist simply of *observations* about the morality of female sex, but seem to lead inexorably to *prescriptions* for how a woman in particular might live a good life, as defined by that particular philosophical tradition. Therefore, what also surfaces in the literature are approaches approved explicitly for women on how they too might “do philosophy” (φιλοσοφεῖν).⁹

*Socrates and Plato*¹⁰

Although Socrates, through the writings of Plato, shows somewhat inconsistent thinking about women and their capacity for ethical living,¹¹ he nonetheless recognizes the social reality of sex distinctions in his discussion of the role of manager (or “guardian,” “philosopher-ruler”) of the ideal

(but not citizen) women, women from elite families in the provinces, Jewish, Egyptian, and “Eastern” women, women who worked in family businesses, women who had control over their own real estate and agricultural production, and wealthy women patrons of cities, temples, and *collegia*. Roman society encouraged “competitive” hierarchical social interactions and judgments, and this entire social system is not usually acknowledged in the philosophical texts.

⁹ I choose this translation to emphasize that philosophy was an enacted way of life, not just a way of thinking.

¹⁰ Since for reasons of space, I cannot provide a detailed analysis of each philosopher's thinking about women's morality, I refer the reader to other histories of women and ancient philosophy: Derksen, *Dialogues*; Lorenné M.G. Clark and Lynda Lange, *The Sexism of Social and Political Theory: Women and Reproduction from Plato to Nietzsche* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 3–15; Kathleen Wider, “Women Philosophers in the Ancient Greek World: Donning the Mantle,” *Hypatia* 1.1 (Spr 1986), 21–62; Mary Ellen Waithé, ed., *A History of Women Philosophers, Vol. 1, 600 B.C.–(500 A.D.* (Boston: Martin Nijhoff, 1987); Julie K. Ward, ed., *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy* (New York: Routledge, 1996); and Prudence Allen, *The Concept of Woman, Vol. 1: The Aristotelian Revolution, 750 B.C.–(A.D. 1250* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997). Cf. also, Rhoda Hadassah Kotzin, “Ancient Greek philosophy,” in eds. Alison M. Jaggar and Iris Marion Young, *A Companion to Feminist Philosophy* (Malden, MA: Blackwell: 1998), 9–20. The writings of a few other ancient philosophers, including Philo, Plutarch, Musonius Rufus, and the Pythagoreans, will receive further treatment in later chapters as literary *comparanda*.

¹¹ Lynda Lange begins her essay “Plato appears to be inconsistent in his treatment of women. He developed in the *Republic* the idea that males and females should be educated equally for the highest functions, while at the same time he believed that women were ultimately not as good as men. A further difficulty with Plato's views on women occurs as a result of his apparent about-face on the question in the *Laws*. Numerous attempts have been made to resolve these difficulties” (“The Function of Equal Education in Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*,” in *Sexism of Social and Political Theory*, 3). Cf. also, Maja Pellikaan-Engel, “Socrates' Blind Spots,” in *Against Patriarchal Thinking*, Proceedings of the VIth Symposium of the International Association of Women Philosophers (IAPH; Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1992), 5–11.

city-state. In the *Republic*, he rejects the idea that capacity for leadership is reserved for men:

Then there is, my friend, no pursuit of the managers of a city that belongs to a woman because she is a woman or to a man because he is a man. But the natural capacities are distributed likewise in both creatures, and women participate in all pursuits according to nature and men in all, but *in all things women are weaker than men*.¹²

Socrates' meritocracy would allow some equality of function in that specially gifted women (alongside similarly gifted men) could govern a city, although women are the "weaker sex."¹³ That Socrates even needs to make an argument for leadership selection based on merit rather than sex shows that societal expectations for men and women were already gendered at least to some extent, and that philosophers were already taking up the topic of the nature of woman *qua* woman.

The divergence of male and female is expressed metaphorically in the *Laws*, where musical expression that is "the magnificent and brave" is masculine, while that which is feminine is "the decorous and *sōphrōn*."¹⁴ Elsewhere Plato clearly portrays women as "naturally" inferior to men: "... since human nature is twofold, the superior [κρείττον] sex is that which hereafter should be designated 'man.'"¹⁵ For philosopher Julia Annas, it is logical that Plato's opinion on male and female varies, because:

... when Plato stops believing that the ideal state can be realized, he also stops thinking that women should do the same jobs as men, even in a greatly

¹² Οὐδὲν ἄρα ἐστίν, ὦ φίλε, ἐπιτήδευμα τῶν πόλιν διοικούντων γυναικὸς διότι γυνή, οὐδ' ἀνδρὸς διότι ἀνὴρ, ἀλλ' ὁμοίως διεσπαρμέναι αἱ φύσεις ἐν ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ζώοις, καὶ πάντων μὲν μετέχει γυνὴ ἐπιτηδευμάτων κατὰ φύσιν, πάντων δὲ ἀνὴρ, ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ ἀσθενέστερον γυνὴ ἀνδρὸς, *Rep.* 455d–e. Women are then recognized as having different natural skills and interests (in medicine, music, athletics, war, philosophy, passions), leading Socrates to his point: "It is also true that one woman may be a guardian, and another not. And is this not like what we decided for men who are naturally guardians?" "Yes, this is." "So the same nature for guardianship of a city can belong to both a woman and a man, except *the one is weaker, and the other is stronger*." "So it appears," Ἔστιν ἄρα καὶ φυλακικὴ γυνή, ἡ δ' οὐ. ἢ οὐ τοιαύτην καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν φυλακικῶν φύσιν ἐξελεξάμεθα; Τοιαύτην μὲν οὖν. Καὶ γυναικὸς ἄρα καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις εἰς φυλακὴν πόλεως, πληρὴ ὅσα ἀσθενεστέρα, ἢ δὲ ἰσχυροτέρα ἐστίν. Φαίνεται, *Rep.* 455e–456a.

¹³ This reference to women's "weakness" is usually understood to be that of lesser biological strength.

¹⁴ τὸ δὴ μεγαλοπρεπὲς οὖν καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀνδρείαν ῥέπον ἀρρενωπὸν φατέον εἶναι, τὸ δὲ πρὸς τὸ κόσμιον καὶ σώφρον μᾶλλον ἀποκλίνειν θηλυγενέστερον ὡς ἐν παραδοτέον ἐν τε τῷ νόμῳ καὶ λόγῳ. *Laws* 802e. Note that here Plato has referred to two of the four cardinal virtues, with brave (ἀνδρείος) being masculine, and moderate (σώφρον) being feminine.

¹⁵ διπλῆς δὲ οὐσης τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, τὸ κρείττον τοιοῦτον εἶη γένος δ καὶ ἔπειτα κεκλήσοιτο ἀνὴρ, *Timaeus* 42a; trans. W.R.M. Lamb.

improved state Although women are still educated and forced into public to some extent, this is merely so that they can be controlled, since their potential for virtue is less than man's¹⁶

In any case, what looks like inconsistency in Socrates' and Plato's thinking on the nature of woman ought not obscure the fundamental shared understanding that human beings come in two sexes, and that this biological fact is generally determinative of both moral virtue and social roles. Such ideas are widespread in the ancient philosophical debate on the topic of "woman."

Aristotle

One of the earliest statements about human gender is found in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, where he cites a so-called "table of opposites."¹⁷ Developed within the Pythagorean movement, these "opposites" were considered as principles or elements (ἀρχαί) for philosophical thinking about the origin and structure of the universe. The series lists ten pairs of items that can be placed in two columns:

<i>limit</i>	<i>boundless</i>
<i>odd</i>	<i>even</i>
<i>one</i>	<i>many</i>
<i>right</i>	<i>left</i>
<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>
<i>rest</i>	<i>motion</i>
<i>straight</i>	<i>curved</i>
<i>light</i>	<i>dark</i>
<i>good</i>	<i>evil</i>
<i>square</i>	<i>oblong</i> ¹⁸

Based on other Pythagorean texts that elucidate these terms, the prevailing modern interpretation is that the right column is inferior to the left one,

¹⁶ "Plato's *Republic* and Feminism," in *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy* (ed. Julie K. Ward; New York: Routledge, 1996), 12. She cites *Laws* 780d–781b, where Plato talks about rules for women at public meals. Women are said to be "weak" (ἀσθενή), "more secretive" (λαθραιότερος), "trickier" (ἐπικλοπώτερος), and "the female nature is to us inferior to that of males in virtue," ἡ θήλεια ἡμῖν φύσις ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀρετὴν χείρων τῆς τῶν ἀρρένων (781a–b).

¹⁷ The Greek for this "table" is συστοιχία, which means a *column* or *series* of correlated things or ideas; LSJ, s.v. συστοιχία.

¹⁸ *Metaphysics* I.986a. "Others of this group say there are ten principles, which are stated according to a series: limit and boundless, ... [etc.]," ἕτεροι δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων τὰς ἀρχὰς δέκα λέγουσιν εἶναι τὰς κατὰ συστοιχίαν λεγομένας, πέρας καὶ ἄπειρον, περιττὸν καὶ ἄρτιον, ἓν καὶ πλῆθος, δεξιὸν καὶ ἀριστερόν, ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ, ἡρεμοῦν καὶ κινούμενον, εὐθὺ καὶ καμπύλον, φῶς καὶ σκότος, ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακόν, τετράγωνον καὶ ἑτερόμηκες.

since the series associates *female* with “left,” “dark,” and “evil,” and *male* with “right,” “light,” and “good.”¹⁹ This series reiterates the idea that male and female were viewed as distinguished from and, in this perception, even opposite to each other, and that women were thought to be in some ways inferior in nature to men.

While Aristotle states that he plans to go beyond the “series of opposites” in investigating the cosmos, he nonetheless builds his own philosophy on such principles. Reflections on the two sexes found in human nature confirmed for him that human society is correctly structured around the human sexual binary. For example, in his description of the household as the basic and crucial component of the state, he names three relationships as the “first and smallest parts of the household: master and slave, husband and wife, and father and children.”²⁰ Although making no distinctions between male and female *slaves*, or male and female *children*, Aristotle must, of course, take up the topic of sexual difference in discussing the married couple. He then gives the male householder the responsibility of:

¹⁹ Additionally, Genevieve Lloyd maintains that “In the Pythagorean table of opposites, ... femaleness was explicitly linked with the unbounded—the vague, the indeterminate—as against the bounded—the precise and clearly determined. The Pythagoreans saw the world as a mixture of principles associated with the determinate form, seen as good, and others associated with formlessness—the unlimited, irregular or disorderly—which were seen as bad or inferior” (*The Man of Reason: “Male” and “Female” in Western Philosophy* [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984], 3). Kathleen C. Cook appears to offer an *apologia* for Aristotle when she states: “It would seem both that Aristotle’s theory of reproduction is not simply premised upon popular prejudice about the inferiority of females, and that there is reason not to attribute these ideas [the Table of Opposites] to Aristotle as their source or initial intellectual legitimator, although the ideas are used by him” (“Sexual Inequality in Aristotle’s Theories of Reproduction and Inheritance,” in *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*, 57). From a modern feminist perspective, Derksen asks: “why would anyone want to make the male-female distinction into a fundamental category of reality and place the female on the negative, irrational side? One can speculate that perhaps men think women are less rational than [sic] they are because men and women think differently; or that perhaps at that time there was already a difference in the amount of formal, theoretical, education which men and women had; or perhaps that it is simply the desire of men to see themselves as superior to women, with superiority linked to rationality and intelligence” (*Dialogues*, 3). Sabina Lovibond brings this “table” into conversation with Plato in “An Ancient Theory of Gender: Plato and the Pythagorean Table,” in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 88–101.

²⁰ ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐν τοῖς ἐλαχίστοις πρώτων ἑκαστον ζητητέον, πρῶτα δὲ καὶ ἐλάχιστα μέρη οἰκίας δεσπότης καὶ δούλος, καὶ πόσις καὶ ἄλοχος, καὶ πατήρ καὶ τέκνα, *Pol.* 1253b. Throughout his discussion of the household, Aristotle compares women’s roles and abilities with those of slaves and children. I provide only a brief summary here for illustrative purposes. For further discussion of Aristotle and many other philosophical texts on these household relationships, see David L. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (SBLMS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981); also, Derksen, *Dialogues*, ch. 3.

ruling over the wife and children (as over free people, yet not the same manner of rule, but as republican governance over the wife, and as monarchical governance over the children); for the male is *by nature* more capable of command than the female The male always has this approach toward the female²¹

Aristotle commences by identifying sexual difference (“by nature”) as the main rationale for gendered roles in the family and society.

Consequently, if free women are that different from free men, he must then consider their capacity to develop virtues: “And must a woman be *sōphrōn* and brave and just? ... And indeed, in general, one must consider this concerning the nature of the ruled and the ruler: whether virtue is the same or different?”²² A little later on, Aristotle answers his own questions:

All must participate in [the ethical virtues], but not in the same way, but as far as each has a particular employment So that it is apparent that there is an ethical virtue for all who have been mentioned, and that the *sōphrosynē* of a woman is not the same as for a man, neither bravery or justice, as Socrates supposed, but there is the bravery of ruler and [courage of] subordinate, and it is likewise with the other [virtues].²³

Thus, Aristotle concludes, women can and must exhibit moral virtue, but in a different manner than men do, because of their subordinated position in social relationships. This conclusion is not uncommon in a wide range of philosophical texts.

Xenophon

For a more complete description of the desirable roles for a woman within the household, we turn to the *Oeconomicus* by Xenophon.²⁴ Professing to be an account of Socrates’ conversation with a student Critobulus, these two men discourse on managing agricultural property (including slaves),

²¹ καὶ γὰρ γυναικὸς ἄρχει καὶ τέκνων, ὡς ἐλευθέρων μὲν ἀμφοῖν, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ γυναικὸς μὲν πολιτικῶς τέκνων δὲ βασιλικῶς· τὸ τε γὰρ ἄρρην φύσει τοῦ θήλεος ἡγεμονικώτερον ... τὸ δ’ ἄρρην αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ θῆλυ τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον, *Pol.* 1259a–b.

²² καὶ δεῖ τὴν γυναῖκα εἶναι σώφρονα καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ δικαίαν ... καθόλου δὲ τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ἐπισκεπτέον περὶ ἀρχομένου φύσει καὶ ἄρχοντος, πότερον ἢ αὐτῇ ἀρετῇ ἢ ἐτέρᾳ, *Pol.* 1259b.

²³ δεῖν μὲν μετέχειν πάντας, ἀλλ’ οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ἀλλ’ ὅσον ἱκανὸν ἐκάστῳ πρὸς τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔργον ... ὥστε φανερόν ἐστι ἔστιν ἡθικὴ ἀρετὴ τῶν εἰρημένων πάντων, καὶ οὐχ ἡ αὐτῇ σωφροσύνη γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρός, οὐδ’ ἀνδρεία καὶ δικαιοσύνη, καθάπερ ᾤετο Σωκράτης, ἀλλ’ ἡ μὲν ἀρχικὴ ἀνδρεία ἢ δ’ ὑπηρετική, ὁμοίως δ’ ἔχει καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας, *Pol.* 1260a.

²⁴ For the text’s transmission history and further analysis, see the recent translation and commentary by Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Xenophon “Oeconomicus”: A Social and Historical Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 1–96, 213–345.

farming techniques, and, most relevant to our topic, the responsibilities of husband and wife in the supervision of the estate.

Socrates begins by invoking the *hetaira* Aspasia as one who could give good advice about wives:²⁵

I will introduce Aspasia to you. Being more knowledgeable than I am, she will show you all these things. I think that a woman who is a good domestic partner [κοινωνὸν ἀγαθὴν οἴκου] is an excellent counterpart to her man for the good. For on the whole, possessions come into the house through the activities of the man, but they are mostly expended through the supplies of the woman. And if these things go well the estate increases, but if handled poorly the estate decreases.²⁶

Here we see evidence that household activities are gendered at least to some extent, with the man responsible for the accumulation of goods and the woman responsible for their dispensation. Socrates then narrates a conversation had with a prosperous farmer named Ischomachus, who taught his young wife everything she needed to know in order to perform her domestic duties well. This Ischomachus describes a more or less separate but equal work situation between spouses based on biological distinctions:

Since both these indoor and outdoor tasks require work and carefulness, and it seems god prepared, it appears to me, the nature of the woman for indoor tasks and concerns, and the nature of the man for outdoor tasks and concerns. For he equipped the man's body and soul to be better able to endure cold and heat and travel and battles; thus, he assigned the outdoor tasks to him. But the body of the woman being less capable of these things, it seems to me the god naturally assigned to her the indoor tasks.²⁷

The assignment of tasks based on “nature” (that is, one's biological sex) is not an inferior or evil thing within the logic of the *Oeconomicus*, since it is

²⁵ Pomeroy notes: “It is quite remarkable that Socrates (or Xenophon) should choose the *hetaira* Aspasia as an example, inasmuch as he is discussing wives and has previously warned Critobolus about *hetairai* (i.3)” (*Xenophon*, 232).

²⁶ συστήσω δέ σοι ἐγὼ καὶ Ἀσπασίαν, ἣ ἐπιστημονέστερον ἐμοὶ σοι ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδείξει. νομίζω δὲ γυναῖκα κοινωνὸν ἀγαθὴν οἴκου οὖσαν πάνυ ἀντίρροπον εἶναι τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν. ἔρχεται μὲν γάρ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν διὰ τῶν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πράξεων τὰ κτήματα ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, δαπανᾶται δὲ διὰ τῶν τῆς γυναικὸς ταμιευμάτων τὰ πλείστα· καὶ εὖ μὲν τούτων γιγνομένων αὐξοῦνται οἱ οἴκοι, κακῶς δὲ τούτων πραττομένων οἱ οἴκοι μειοῦνται, *Oec.* 3.14–15.

²⁷ ἐπεὶ δ' ἀμφοτέρω ταῦτα καὶ ἔργων καὶ ἐπιμελείας δεῖται τὰ τε ἔνδον καὶ τὰ ἔξω, καὶ τὴν φύσιν, φάναι, εὐθὺς παρεσκεύασεν ὁ θεός, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, τὴν μὲν τῆς γυναικὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔνδον ἔργα καὶ ἐπιμελήματα, τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω. βίγη μὲν γάρ καὶ θάλλη καὶ ὁδοιπορίας καὶ στρατείας τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μάλλον δίνασθαι καρτερεῖν κατεσκεύασεν ὥστε τὰ ἔξω ἐπέταξεν αὐτῷ ἔργα· τῇ δὲ γυναικὶ ἦττον τὸ σῶμα δυνατόν πρὸς ταῦτα φύσας τὰ ἔνδον ἔργα αὐτῇ, φάναι ἔφη, προστάξει μοι δοκεῖ ὁ θεός, *Oec.* 7.22–23.

“good” (here, *καλός*) for the woman to remain indoors as opposed to living outside, while it is “a disgrace” (*αἷσχιον*) for the man to stay indoors rather than attending to the outdoor tasks.²⁸ In fact, it is a religious duty to behave in accordance with one’s natural sex, since otherwise one would be neglecting one’s duty (*ἀτακτός*) toward the gods.²⁹

Comparing his wife to a queen bee presiding over an active hive, Ischomachus details the many tasks that are necessary for that female insect who controls a large colony.³⁰ Just as the other bees loyally follow the queen bee when she deserts the hive for another, so the members of the wife’s household will honor her, and even more so, the older and wiser she becomes.³¹ As a philosopher of estate management, Ischomachus reminds her that “the beautiful and good things of life increase for people, not on account of the bloom of youth, but on account of the virtues.”³² Since the whole household would benefit from the wife’s excellence, or virtue, in domestic economy, Xenophon’s ideal woman performs her tasks as a “philosopher of the household.”

Musonius Rufus, Plutarch, and Crates

Certainly some ancient philosophers thought in less strictly gendered ways about the virtues of men and women. Socrates already suggested this in postulating that some women naturally exercised administrative (and athletic and artistic) skills equal to those of some men, and the Pythagoreans were renowned for their women philosophers, seventeen of whom are listed by Iamblichus at the very end of his *De Vita Pythagorica* (36.267).³³ Among the Stoics, two discourses from Musonius Rufus explicitly consider issues of philosophical living for women: “That women too should study

²⁸ καὶ καλὰ δὲ εἶναι ὁ νόμος ἀποδείκνυσιν ἃ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔφυσεν ἐκάτερον μᾶλλον δύνασθαι. τῇ μὲν γὰρ γυναικὶ κάλλιον ἔνδον μένειν ἢ θυμαυλεῖν, τῷ δὲ ἀνδρὶ αἷσχιον ἔνδον μένειν ἢ τῶν ἔξω ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, *Oec.* 7.30–31.

²⁹ εἰ δὲ τις παρ’ ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔφυσεν ποιεῖ, ἴσως τι καὶ ἀτακτῶν τοὺς θεοὺς οὐ λήθει, *Oec.* 7.31.

³⁰ I examine the symbolism of the bee in more detail in Chapter Two.

³¹ καὶ μὴ δέη σε φοβεῖσθαι μὴ προϊούσης τῆς ἡλικίας ἀτιμωτέρα ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ γένη, ἀλλὰ πιστεύης ὅτι πρεσβυτέρα γιγνομένη ὅσῳ ἂν καὶ ἐμοὶ κοινωνὸς καὶ παισὶν οἴκου φύλαξ ἀμείνων γίγνη, τοσούτῳ καὶ τιμωτέρα ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἔσει, *Oec.* 7.42.

³² τὰ γὰρ καλὰ τε κάγαθά, ἐγὼ ἔφην, οὐ διὰ τὰς ὥραιότητας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς ἀρετάς εἰς τὸν βίον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπαύξεται, *Oec.* 7.43.

³³ Compared with his count of 218 Pythagorean men. The only female names on Iamblichus’ list that match the texts I mention later are Theano, Myia, and perhaps Phintys (if her name is the same as “Philtys”).

philosophy,” and “Should daughters receive the same education as sons?”³⁴ Although Musonius basically affirms that women and girls ought to share in the benefits of such education, he also affirms some gendering of moral behavior. For example, he claims that from philosophy, a woman would learn to be “proficient in household management” (οἰκονομική), “skilled at estimating what benefits the household” (ἐκλογιστικὴν τῶν οἴκῳ συμφερόντων), and “capable of ruling over the household slaves” (ἀρχικὴν τῶν οἰκετῶν).³⁵ Martha C. Nussbaum states that here Musonius depends upon a “separate spheres” tradition: “The husband is imagined as a ‘good citizen’; the wife as a ‘good household manager.’”³⁶ One’s progress in virtue is exhibited in following the social roles appropriate to one’s sex.

In *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, Plutarch wrote to a young couple, saying that his message is derived from the “main points you [plural] have often heard while being educated in philosophy.”³⁷ Although Plutarch thinks of philosophy as a boon to married life because it makes both partners “gentle and amenable to one other,”³⁸ he nonetheless addresses more of his advice on marriage to the bride than to the groom.³⁹ The disparity may suggest either the importance of the role of wife for a woman, or his assumption that a woman needed more instruction, since she is somehow morally inferior. As with Musonius, Plutarch’s female students of philosophy still need to develop and enact their virtue within conventional feminine boundaries.

The Cynic philosopher Crates rejected traditional gender roles for at least one female Cynic philosopher. In a letter to his wife Hipparchia, who was also a Cynic, he says,

³⁴ In addition to the discourses of Musonius, Elizabeth Asmis analyzes texts about marriage from the Stoics Cicero, Antipater of Tarsus, Hierocles, and Epictetus (“The Stoics on Women,” in *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*, 68–92).

³⁵ *Fr.* 3 (Lutz, 40, lines 10–12), from “Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates” (ed. and trans. Cora E. Lutz; *Yale Classical Studies* 10 [1947]: 1–47).

³⁶ “The Incomplete Feminism of Musonius Rufus, Platonist, Stoic, and Roman,” in *The Sleep of Reason* (eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 300–301.

³⁷ ἀκρόατε πολλάκις ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ παρατρεφόμενοι κεφάλαια, *Advice, Mor.* 138C (Intro.).

³⁸ πρᾶσος ... καὶ χειροῖθεις ἀλλήλοις, *Advice, Mor.* 138B (Intro.).

³⁹ Pomeroy rightly notes that “Of the forty-eight chapters in the *Advice*, nine are addressed to both bride and groom, eleven to the groom, and twenty-eight, or more than half the total, to the bride alone. Like Xenophon, Plutarch finds less to criticize and fewer potential problems in the husband’s behavior” (*Plutarch’s “Advice to the Bride and Groom” and “A Consolation to His Wife”: English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* [ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999], 40). I analyze Plutarch’s texts in later chapters in relation to the Pythagorean and Pastoral letters.

I am sending to you the tunic, which you wove and sent to me, because it is forbidden for those who undergo patient endurance to wear such things, so I would have you stop this work, accomplished with much eagerness, in order that you might appear to the people to be someone who is loving of her husband. If I had married you for these reasons, then you would do well, and this [eagerness] would be displayed to me through this. But if [I married] on account of philosophy, which you yourself also yearned for, so be glad to dismiss these pursuits, and try to be of more benefit for human life. For you learned these things from both me and Diogenes.⁴⁰

Here Crates appears to give the strongest renunciation of a gender-differentiated philosophical way of life, and yet, since it is couched in the typical Cynic disdain for social conventions, we cannot be sure what he thought about the philosophical capacity of most women. In another letter to Hipparchia, he once again criticizes her for making him a tunic, and maintains she should have left the wool-spinning “to the other women, who did not yearn for any of the things you do.”⁴¹ It seems that even Crates recognizes that a female philosopher who lives as a man would be remarkable among her sex.

Pythagorean Writings

As noted above, according to Aristotle some members of the Pythagorean philosophical movement already considered “male” and “female” to be essential categories for describing the structure of the cosmos. Several later Pythagoreans seem to have carried this theoretical idea into literature that, like Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, addresses morality within household relationships. While much scholarly debate surrounds the dates, provenances, and “authenticity” of the texts ascribed to Pythagoreans, legends about Pythagoras, his family, and other Pythagoreans as well as writings preserving their philosophical ideals increased in popularity in the late Hellenistic and Roman imperial worlds.⁴² What is significant for my argument is that

⁴⁰ “Ἐπεμψά σοι τὴν ἐξωμίδα, ἣν ὑφηνάμενή μοι ἔπεμψας, ὅτι ἀπαγορεύεται τοῖς καρτερίᾳ χρωμένοις τοιαῦτα ἀμπεχεσθαι, καὶ ἵνα σε τούτου τοῦ ἔργου ἀποπαύσαιμι, εἰς ὃ πολλὴ σπουδὴ ἐξήλθες, ἵνα τις δόξης φιλανδρὸς τοῖς πολλοῖς εἴναι. ἐγὼ δὲ εἰ μὲν διὰ ταῦτά σε ἡγάμην, εὖ γε ποιεῖς καὶ αὐτὴ διὰ τούτων ἐπιδεικνυμένη μοι· εἰ δὲ διὰ φιλοσοφίαν, ἥς καὶ αὐτὴ ὠρέχθης, τὰ τοιαῦτα σπουδασματα ἔα χαίρειν, πειρῶ δὲ εἰς τὰ κρείττω τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν βίον ὠφελεῖν. ταῦτα γὰρ ἔμαθες καὶ παρ’ ἐμοὶ καὶ παρὰ Διογένηι, *Cynic Epistle*, #30 (from *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition* [ed. Abraham J. Malherbe; Vol. 12; SBLSPS; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977]). This is the entire letter.

⁴¹ ταῖς ἄλλαις γυναιξίν, αἱ μηδενὸς τῶν αὐτῶν σοι ὠρέχθησαν, *Ep.* 32.

⁴² One important question is how to label the texts related to the later Pythagorean movement. Johan C. Thom reviews the situation: “Neopythagoreanism does not constitute a

the “household ethics” texts themselves are very often gendered; that is, not only does the subject matter covered fall into the categories “masculine” and “feminine,” but the named authors and often the recipients are male or female corresponding to the gender of the contents. The result is that advising about the character and roles of women is typically undertaken by Pythagorean women, while Pythagorean men discuss the responsibilities of virtuous men.

Under the names of five women (Melissa, Myia, Periktione, Phintys, and Theano) there are twelve extant texts—nine letters⁴³ and three discourses—the dates for which fall somewhere between the late-second century BCE and the early-second century CE. Nine of these texts specifically address social expectations for women in their roles as wife, mother, and mistress presiding over her slaves and household. When the Pythagorean women’s writings are read as a group, this commonality of topics is quite pronounced: the twelve texts deal more often with women’s household roles and moral behavior than with any other topic. Two letters, *Myia to Phyllis* and *Theano to Euboule*, concern mothers and childrearing, while *Theano to Kallisto* advises the female recipient on managing household slaves. Instructions on marriage are the subject of *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Nikostrate*. A Pythagorean letter with an entirely different text history, *Theano to Eurydike*, also deals with wifely responsibilities. Theano’s letters thus cover the three major roles women held in households: as wives, mothers, and managers of the household and its slaves. As seen previously, these three roles parallel those for males in the three pairs of relationships defined by Aristotle as essential to well-ordered households: husband-wife, father-child, master-

conceptually homogeneous philosophical tradition, nor does it have very definite chronological boundaries At least some of the numerous pseudepigraphical Pythagorean texts collected by H. Thesleff ... should be dated in the Hellenistic age, while other Pythagorean writings usually considered late may also have had their origin in this period. Consequently, some form of Pythagoreanism (or perhaps more than one) probably existed in the interval between Aristoxenus [fourth c. BCE] and the first century BCE. Whether to call texts from the period Hellenistic or Neopythagorean is a moot point; the former description prejudices the dating of the texts, while the latter unnecessarily implies a decisive break with the earlier tradition, as well as some form of conceptual unity” (“The Passions in Neopythagorean Writings,” in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought* [ed. John T. Fitzgerald; Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies; London; New York: Routledge, 2008], 68–69). For the texts under investigation here I use the simple adjective “Pythagorean” in order to indicate that the female authorial pseudonyms are drawn from Pythagoreanism.

⁴³ Among the texts of fifty-five named male authors, there are only four letters: Lysis to Hipparchos, Pythagoras to Anaximenes, Pythagoras to Hieron, and Telauges to Philolaos. None of these deals with household *topoi*. It is a philosophical strategy in and of itself to use the letter genre, and also to ascribe letters to the great teachers in philosophical movements.

slave (*Pol.*, I. 1253b.1–14), which are found in other philosophical writings and household management texts, as well as in the NT.⁴⁴ Two discourses, *On the Harmony of a Woman* by Periktione and *On the Sôphrosynê of a Woman* by Phintys, address more generally how to be a good woman, which is defined explicitly as the display of feminine virtue by means of modest adornment, speech, and public demeanor, and the fulfillment of the three household roles appropriate to women. In sum, all five women Pythagorean authors have something to say about the roles of women in family, household and even society. Other Pythagorean texts written by (or ascribed to) men also address household ethics.⁴⁵ What justification is there for separating out the texts according to the sex of their authors? One reason is the preponderance of attention devoted to the household in the women's texts: not only are nine of the twelve texts concerned with women's behavior, but also their combined length (at 423 lines) far exceeds that of the four texts not referring to female-specific behavior (45 lines).⁴⁶ As noted above, a rough survey of the content of all the men's texts reveals much less attention paid to this subject.⁴⁷ Secondly, those writings by men regarding household ethics

⁴⁴ See again, Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive*.

⁴⁵ Some of these are referred to in Balch's essay "Neopythagorean Moralists and the New Testament Household Codes," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.26.1 (1992): 380–411. He cites material from Archytas, Bryson (for whom Thesleff includes only fragments in Greek of a text, *Oeconomicus*, which is extant in full in Arabic and Latin), Callicratidas, Charondas, Damippus, Diotogenes, Eccelus, Hippodamus, Ocellus, Pempelus, and Zaleucas, as well as from four women: Melissa, Periktione, Phintys, and Theano. (Oddly, he does not mention the letter by Myia.) He also includes selections from the biographies of Pythagoras by Iamblichus and Porphyry. Balch sketches some of the parallels between the *Pseudopythagorica* and the New Testament on nine topics related to household ethics: house and city, gods, wives (under which he refers to Callicratidas, on husbands governing wives; so why is this not under the following category?), husbands, children, fathers (note, not "mothers," or "parents," although he includes quotes from Pythagorean women on childrearing), slaves, masters, and concord. Balch's choices of topics, labels, and order of treatment could all be critiqued further, but, as he says, this "is intended as an initial attempt to collect the similar material in the two traditions, not as a detailed exegetical study" (392).

⁴⁶ I do not include the writings for which there are titles only, although some of the titles are also suggestive of texts that may have been written for or about women, e.g., Arignote's "Concerning the Rites of Bacchus," (Βαχχικά), and her "Initiates of Dionysus," Τελεταὶ Διονύσου (Holger Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period* [Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 30/1; Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi, 1965], 51, lines 4–5). Also Theano's "Advice for Women," Παραινέσεις γυναικεῖαι (ibid., 195, line 6) might have provided extremely interesting reading for my project.

⁴⁷ Using statistics from the extant texts, eleven men out of fifty-five male authors in Thesleff's collection (or twenty percent) write about the household, and, although I have not counted the number of lines devoted to each topic as I have for the women authors, they clearly devote much less space proportionately to the topic. (My assessment does not

almost never address the wife-mother-household manager roles of women or women's moral character. The men's texts might deal with how a man can select an appropriate wife or with marital "laws," or they may lightly touch on the father's role in childrearing.⁴⁸

There is only one source in which a Pythagorean male addresses women and their roles directly and in more detail. Iamblichus' *Vita Pythagorica* reports a speech by Pythagoras himself in which he supposedly gave instructions about proper sacrifices for women and about a wife's relationship to her husband (among other things, that sex with her husband did not make her ritually unclean).⁴⁹ But in the other Pythagorean writings, no male writer attempts to imitate the example of his founder in giving philosophical advice to women. Instead, that responsibility appears to be allocated to the letters and discourses attributed to female Pythagoreans.

include the biographies of Pythagoras by Iamblichus and Porphyry.) Male Pythagoreans discourse about a variety of "philosophical" topics, including Pythagorean distinctions like the mysteries of numbers, asceticism, and the harmonic order of the universe. These conclusions are supported by, *inter alia*: Thomas Taylor, *Political fragments of Archytas, Charondas, Zaleucus, and other ancient Pythagoreans, preserved by Stobæus; and also, Ethical fragments of Hierocles ... preserved by the same author* (Chiswick, printed by C. Whittingham for the translator, 1822); Thesleff's conspectus (*An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period* [Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora 24/3; Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi, 1961], 8–24); Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie's translation of many of the texts in Thesleff's collection (*The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library: An Anthology of Ancient Writings Which Relate to Pythagoras and Pythagorean Philosophy* [compiled and translated by Guthrie, additional translations by Thomas Taylor and Arthur Fairbanks, Jr., intro. and ed. by David R. Fideler; Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1987]); Balch, "Neopythagorean Moralists"; and Will Deming's more recent translation of Ocellus Lucanus' *On the Nature of the Universe (Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7* [2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], Appendix B).

⁴⁸ Among male authors, Callicratidas (*De dom. Felic.* in Stob. *Anth.* 4.28.18) and Ocellus (*De univ. nat.* in Stob., *Anth.* 1.20.3–5) give advice to men on how to choose a good wife, and how to treat her. Ocellus also discusses the father's role in training children. Pempelus (*De parent.* in Stob., *Anth.* 4.25.52) writes about honoring one's parents, and male authors discuss the connection between the well-ordered household and the city, among them: Callicratidas, Ocellus, Hippodamus (*De rep.* in Stob., *Anth.* 4.34.71), Diotogenes (*De regn.* in Stob., *Anth.* 4.7.61), and Eccelus (*De iust.* in Stob., *Anth.* 3.9.51). About women, Charondas (*Prooem.* in Stob., *Anth.* 4.2.24) has one "law" on the necessity for wifely fidelity, alongside one for husbands. In a short fragment, Zaleucas (*Prooem.* in Stob., *Anth.* 4.2.19) has a similar law regarding the behavior of a chaste wife. Callicratidas depicts the three relationships that are the basis of the household this way: "and the husband is the governor, and the wife is the governed, and their offspring is their assistant" καὶ ἄρχων μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἀρχόμενον δὲ ἡ γυνὴ, ἐπίκουρον δὲ τὸ γενναῖον ἐκ τούτων, Thesleff, *Pythagorean Texts*, 105, 8–9). Once again, see Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive*, and his "Neopythagorean Moralists" for other examples of the household ethics material.

⁴⁹ Iamblichus, *VP* 54–57.

The Pythagorean women's literature from the Hellenistic and Roman eras extends the ancient moral philosophical discussion on the topic of "woman" by explaining how her virtuous behavior may be exhibited through fulfilling her proper domestic roles. This is accomplished by the unusual strategy of the production of texts that are ascribed to female authors who write to female recipients on women's subjects like household relationships. The literary gendering of virtue and of the philosophical life has reached a well-defined position within this Pythagorean text collection, supporting the notion of moral women as "philosophers of the household."

In spite of the potential these textual voices possess for delineating Greco-Roman attitudes toward female philosophers and morality, to my knowledge there is only one modern English translation of all the writings ascribed to the Pythagorean women: that of I.M. Plant in his *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome: An Anthology*.⁵⁰ The lack of easy access to the literature in Greek and English is a basic research problem, one that is only compounded by the need for much deeper critical analysis of the sources. Moreover, there are no commentaries or monographs that consider the Pythagorean women's texts in their own right.

However, in her work on Philo's rhetorical presentation of the female members of the Therapeutae, Joan E. Taylor gives significant attention to the evidence of women in the different Greek and Roman philosophical schools,

⁵⁰ Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004, 68–80, 83–86. The available translations are examined further in Chapter One, but I provide a short summary here. Waithe relied upon translations by Vickie Lynn Harper, but this volume is missing *Melissa to Kleareta* (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 1987). Pomeroy's *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* includes a full translation of Periktione's treatise (New York: Schocken, 1975, repr. 1995, 134–136; substantially reprinted in *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra* [Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984], 68–70). The much-used anthology by Mary R. Lefkowitz, and Maureen B. Fant provides a translation of part of *On the Sôphrosynê of a Woman* (*Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook in Translation* [1st ed.; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982; 2nd ed. 1992], 163–164), as well as the entire letter of *Myia to Phyllis* (ibid., 187–188). Abraham J. Malherbe translated *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Euboule* (*Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986], 82–85); the translation of *Melissa to Kleareta* also appears in his essay "The *Virtus Feminarum* in 1 Timothy 2:9–15," in *Renewing Tradition: Studies in Texts and Contexts in Honor of James W. Thompson* (eds. Mark. W. Hamilton, Thomas H. Olbricht, Jeffrey Peterson; Princeton Theological Monograph Series; Eugene, OR: Pickwick [Wipf and Stock], 2006), 62–63. P. Allen's work employs fragments of the letters (including *Melissa to Kleareta*) and treatises in order to explain the role of gender in ancient philosophical discussion (*The Concept of Woman* [1997], 141–158). These translated sections are from the French translation by Meunier (1932).

including Pythagoreanism.⁵¹ She provides a well-argued analysis of the references to such women, along with the texts ascribed to some of them, and proposes that the female Pythagoreans, among others, can be placed in a paradigm that she calls “‘Just a Housewife’: Woman as a Model of Virtue.”⁵² This paradigm developed as an extremely useful moralizing tool:

Certain women are given as models which women should follow. They are defined by male authors with this specific intention, and no whiff of any unsavory element is to be found in these constructions. The model women are constructed in ways that would be considered exemplary for the women of the author’s circle.⁵³

Taylor’s insight into the literary *constructions* of famous women as prescriptive examples highlights one noteworthy element in the moral training for women. Further, while she does not examine the Pythagorean women’s treatises and letters much at all, she proposes a version of the concept of “philosophers of the household” when she says “... they incorporated philosophy into the world of women the texts by the women show that the *logos* could be at home in the home.”⁵⁴ With this statement, Taylor correlates the “world of women” with the wider world of philosophy.

Still, previous scholarship on the Pythagorean women’s literature has suggested, but not provided, answers to complex and critical questions like: What is their text history and how does that process influence their interpretation?⁵⁵ Are they pseudepigraphic and, if so, what does that say about their authors’ intentions?⁵⁶ What kinds of rhetorical strategies have been deemed advantageous by the authors for communicating their logic and opinions?⁵⁷ How do the treatments of the subject matter—feminine

⁵¹ *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo’s “Therapeutae” Reconsidered* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), esp. ch. 8 and 240–246.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 222–224.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 224.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 243–244.

⁵⁵ The crucial volume by Alfons Städele carefully maps out the history of the letters and lifts up parallels in other literature. I could not have delved so deeply into these texts without this prior work (*Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer* [Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie, vol. 115; Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1980]), but Städele’s project does not then investigate the history of their interpretation. The Greek edition of these five letters is included Appendix A.

⁵⁶ Within the fields of classics and philosophy, investigations of the Pythagorean women’s literature tend to focus on the issues of the pseudonyms of the senders. I critique such previous research more fully in Chapter Two, and give compelling evidence for considering at least the letters to be pseudepigraphic.

⁵⁷ I have found no scholarship at all that deals with the “art of persuasion” in the Pythagorean women’s literature. However, some research has summarized and debated the activities

goodness—parallel, modify, and deviate from other contemporaneous discussions?⁵⁸ The initial undertaking of my project, then, is to examine the Pythagorean women's letters through such questions in order to rectify the deficiencies in prior scholarship. Furthermore, the answers I present lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the value these specific texts possess as resources for the moral-philosophical training of women in the Roman Empire.

The Pastoral Letters

The New Testament Pastoral Letters have much in common in vocabulary, literary character, and subject matter with ancient philosophical texts on ethics.⁵⁹ While these pseudonymous letters are, of course, infused with

and thought of the named female philosophers, notably: Wider, "Women Philosophers in the Ancient Greek World," 26–40; Waithe, ed., *A History of Women Philosophers*, esp. 5–7, 59–74; Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves*, 131–136, and *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 59–74; Debra Nails, "The Pythagorean Women Philosophers: Ethics of the Household," in *Ionian Philosophy* (ed. K.J. Boudouris; Athens: International Association for Greek Philosophy, 1989): 291–297; Richard Hawley, "The Problem of Women Philosophers in Ancient Greece," in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 70–87; Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 173–226; and Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), ch. 4.

⁵⁸ This question has received more attention due to the historical search for linguistic and epigraphic parallels. That this subject matter of Greco-Roman social expectations for women remains of interest to scholars is due in large part to twentieth-century developments. Some feminist thinkers began to trace the historical path of the concept of sex differentiation, and ample ancient evidence was found that prescribed how men and women ought to display their masculinity/femininity. As in most other cultures, such conventions were based on hairstyle, clothing, personal mannerisms, and speech, as well as on the propriety of political, economic, and domestic roles and activities.

Then too the feminist desire for a "usable past" initiated many searches to describe historical foremothers who could, in theory, serve to bolster the movement of modern women into fields of endeavor that were previously occupied predominantly by men. Joan W. Scott surveys this kind of approach by practitioners of "women's history": "... we wanted to tell edifying stories whose import went beyond their literal content to reveal some larger truth about human relationships—in our case, about gender and power [W]e were not just adding women to an existing body of stories, we were changing the way the stories would be told [We wanted] to change the discipline fundamentally by writing women into history and by taking our rightful place as historians" ("Feminism's History," *Journal of Women's History* 16:2 [2004]: 10–29, here 10).

⁵⁹ This view is nicely expressed by Benjamin Fiore: "The epistles [i.e., the Pastorals] not only quote from Greek literature but they employ Greco-Roman hortatory strategies and devices that were taught in the schools and exercised in public and private life. The PE incorporate Greco-Roman moral teachings and presume the applicability of prevailing socio-cultural values to life in the Christian households and house churches" (*The Pastoral*

Christian theology, they also give advice about the purpose of life, seeking virtues and avoiding vices, the proper approach to the passions and to possessions, and how to manage social relationships including how to behave suitably as a member of a Roman household. Taking up the philosophical *topos* of household ethics, the author of the Pastorals confirms the overlay of household onto the community of faith: he has written his letter “in order that you might know how one should live in the household of God, which is the assembly of the living God.”⁶⁰

More expressly for the present project, the Pastoral Letters participate in the ongoing philosophical discussion of women’s moral formation but from an early Christian perspective. Throughout this small letter collection, the author offers sex-specific teachings (1 Tim 2:8–3:1a; 3:1b–13; 5:1–2; 5:3–16; 2 Tim 2:1; 3:6–7; Titus 1:5–9; 2:1–8) because he believes in some essential

Epistles: First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus [Sacra Pagina 12; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007], 6). Ulrike Wagener states of the Pastorals’ content: “Solche Apperzeption popularphilosophischer Tugendlehre stellt—von vereinzelt frühen Stellen abgesehen—innerhalb des Neuen Testaments ein Novum dar ...” (*Die Ordnung des ‘Hauses Gottes’: Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe* [WUNT 2, vol. 65; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994], 82). See also Frances M. Young, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 31–39; I. Howard Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 77–78, 103–104, and his excursions on “εὐσέβεια in the Pastoral Epistles,” 135–144, and “Household codes and station codes,” 231–236; Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 15; Raymond F. Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002), 13–14; and Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 57, 192, 726, 728, 744–750.

For investigations of particular philosophical ideas and strategies in the Pastorals, see Robert J. Karris, “The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles,” *JBL* 92: 4 (1973): 549–564; Stephen Charles Mott, “Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10–14 and III 3–7,” *Novum Testamentum* 20:1 (1978), 22–48; Abraham J. Malherbe, “Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles,” in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Christian Fathers* (ed. W.E. March; San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1980); repr. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989): 121–136; Malherbe, “In Season and out of Season,” *JBL* 103 (1982): 23–41; repr. in *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*, 235–243; David C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS 71; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), ch. 3, “The Haustafel Tradition in the Pastorals”; Lewis R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986); Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986); and Margaret M. Mitchell, “Reading to Virtue,” in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz* (ed. Adela Yarbro Collins; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 110–112.

⁶⁰ 1 Tim. 4:15. ἵνα εἰδῆς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος. Within early Christianity, social relationships within the household overlapped in multiple ways, since groups met in homes for worship, teaching, and meals.

differences between male and female. For instance, he determines that women are “naturally” more likely to be seduced into immorality (1 Tim 2:14; cf. 5:11–13; 2 Tim 3:6–7). As part of the solution, he prescribes not simply wifely submission to a husband (Titus 2:5), but the total fulfillment of the three socially-approved female domestic roles of wife, mother, and mistress of the household (1 Tim 2:15; 5:9, 14; 2 Tim 1:5; Titus 2:4–5). Any believing woman who adopted this approach to developing her virtue would become the Pastorals’ version of a “philosopher of the household.”

Recently, the Pastorals’ sex-specific notions, which are also found in many other ancient sources, have come into profound tension with more modern (and feminist) ideas and practices.⁶¹ In an accurate and succinct assessment of the place of the Pastorals in Western civilization, Frances M. Young states:

As scripture, the Pastorals have shaped a world in which women and others have been subordinated and devalued on the authority of God’s Word [T]heir actual text reinforces patriarchal hierarchy in family, society and church, apparently providing warrant from scripture. Such texts contained in a sacred authoritative canon cannot but become “texts of terror” in a democratic society which views the position of women, lay people, servants, slaves, etc. in a totally different light.⁶²

The broad ideological divide between Roman times and our own has undoubtedly influenced the motivations for and kinds of recent investigations of the Pastorals.⁶³ For instance, one question consistently arises: does their author have a different “view” of women than that found in the authentic Paulines? If not, how are we to evaluate what look like gender-inclusive

⁶¹ Because these canonical letters are held to be authoritative within Christendom, this conflict has become intense in some circles. Numerous church institutions, from Roman Catholic to Southern Baptist, have struggled with their teachings on gendered morality.

⁶² *Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 146. The phrase “texts of terror” comes from the title of Phyllis Trible’s book, *Texts of Terror: Literary and Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984). Mindful of this history of effects, Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch express a similar feminist perspective when they state: “The Pastorals reserve ecclesial office for males, which has had *disastrous consequences* for two millennia” (*Families in the NT World: Household and House Churches* [Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1997], 185; my italics). Luke Timothy Johnson bemoans such conclusions as theirs: “The Pastorals have managed to offend scholars committed to reformation theology as well as feminists dedicated to liberation theology. Discussions of historical and linguistic issues almost inevitably become entangled with theological and ideological commitments” (*First and Second Letters to Timothy* [AB 35A; New York: Doubleday, 2001], 14).

⁶³ Johnson expresses a similar view about a passage from 1 Timothy: “Since the *Women’s Bible* generated by such nineteenth-century feminists as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the hermeneutical issue—what contemporary Christians should do or think about the text—has colored the reading of 1 Tim 2:9–15, making a clean exegesis difficult” (ibid., 203–204).

impulses of Paul and his mission? But if so, that adds evidence to the argument for their pseudepigraphic nature; it also might say something about their social-historical location.⁶⁴ Moreover, what would it mean for one's interpretation if the Pastorals are not truly written by the apostle? According to Luke Timothy Johnson, "The issue of Pauline authorship shades imperceptibly toward the question of canonical status and theological authority, and dominates all discussion of this literature."⁶⁵ Although no one has, to my knowledge, suggested removing the Pastorals from the canon, there is no doubt that many readers would relegate the Pastorals to a secondary status and give preference instead to the Paul who named women as his co-workers (e.g., Phoebe, Junia, Prisca, Euodia, and Syntyche).

Another interpretive issue revolves around the Pastorals' usefulness as sources for the historical development of early Christianity. What can they tell scholars of women's history about the activities of female believers? Do their teachings on women represent a "decline" from earlier, more egalitarian origins?⁶⁶ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza treats the Pastorals in a section titled: "The Patriarchalization of Church and Ministry,"⁶⁷ while Joanna Dewey asserts: "... [with respect to the subordination of women to men] the author of the Pastorals contradicts Paul and other *early* Christian understandings."⁶⁸ Even though this general depiction of an egalitarian rise followed by a hierarchical fall of early Christian history and literature has been

⁶⁴ Summarizing this position, Johnson states: "Those who argue that the Pastoral Letters are pseudonymous productions of the second century sometimes also take the position that the pseudepigrapher is consciously and deliberately trying to stifle the sort of nascent women's movement that some detect in the apocryphal acts of the Apostles—above all, the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*" (ibid., 205). Towner describes this interpretation as the "current fashion," saying, "... the author can be seen as reacting against women who have risen to leadership positions—who in fact are truer to Paul's original gospel-freedom impulse than even the later Paul himself was to be" (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 19).

⁶⁵ *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 14. Earlier he more bluntly noted: "Those who can deal with Paul's occasional suppression of women in other letters because of his fundamental commitment to equality find nothing in the Pastorals to redeem a sexist attitude" (*Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (The New Testament in Context Series; Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996, 5).

⁶⁶ One of the early claims for this opinion is found in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983; 2nd ed. 1993). Schüssler Fiorenza called the earliest form of the Jesus movement a "discipleship of equals," easily distinguished from later "hierarchical" constructions of church order (including those found in the Pastorals).

⁶⁷ Ibid., 288–291.

⁶⁸ *The Women's Bible Commentary* (eds. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 356; my italics.

correctly criticized by Kathleen Corley,⁶⁹ the Pastorals clearly communicate ideas from the Pauline tradition that are more conventional and less flexible about women's activities within and on behalf of the *ekklēsia*.

For the most part, previous scholarship on the Pastorals has focused on the numerous ancient parallels to their teachings for and about women. Most commentaries and monographs cite and briefly remark on such topics as: feminine virtues, propriety in female clothing, jewelry, hairstyle, food and drink, speech and silence, and family roles and tasks.⁷⁰ However, among researchers of the literary and philosophical influences on the Pastorals, only some have investigated the ways in which moral-philosophical ideas and persuasive strategies have influenced this author's instructional program *for women in particular*.⁷¹ A few other scholars have more substantially relied upon the Pythagorean women's literature for their research, and their proposals have laid pieces of the foundation for the present project.

⁶⁹ *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2002), esp. 1–11, 14–20.

⁷⁰ Ceslas Spicq's excursus remains a font of Greek and Roman literary and inscriptional citations ("La femme chrétienne et ses vertus," *Les Épitres Pastorales* [4th ed.; 2 vols. (Paris: Gabalda, 1969)], 385–425). Other citations from ancient sources may be found in: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (trans. P. Bottolph and A. Yarbro; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 45–49, 74–76, 116, 139–141; Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive* (1981), 36–37, 53–55, 84–85, 95–99, 101–105; Quinn, *The Letter to Titus* (AB 35; New York: Doubleday, 1990), 118–123; Jouette M. Bassler, *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 56–63, 92–98, 160–161, 193–197; Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 84–86, 135–138, 173–174, 179, 230–232, 234–235; and *First and Second Letters to Timothy* (2001), 199–202, 207, 266–268, 406–407, 411–413; Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World* (1997), 104–109, 112–116, 118, 168–170; Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (1999), 182–184, 242–250, 448–457, 468, 576, 585–586, 588, 776; Winter, *Roman Wives*, 98–108, 110–116, 118–119, 129–132, 134–140, 142–144, 152–154, 159–163; Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus* (2002), 66–72, 251, 341–342; and Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (2006), 208–209; Fiore, *The Pastoral Epistles* (2007), 64–69, 104–106, 209. In addition to the Pythagorean women's texts, the following are often cited: Plato, *Republic*, various passages in 451C–461E; and *Laws*, various passages in 6.780E–781D, 7.804E–806C, 8.838A–839B; Xenophon, *Oeconomicus*; Musonius Rufus, *Fr. 3* and *Fr. 4*; Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom*. Dibelius and Conzelmann and Quinn seem to focus on Jewish (including Philo) and other early Christian parallels over those in philosophical texts.

⁷¹ In his detailed examination of the use of role models in philosophical training, Fiore only briefly notes that "Church officials and members are to display the quality of soundness of mind [*sōphrosynē*] (1 Tim 2:9, 15; 3:2; Titus 1:8; 2:2, 5) and the younger addressees are to instill [*sic*] this quality (Titus 2:6) in young men as the *older women are to do in the younger women* (Titus 2:4)" (*Function of Personal Example*, 220; my italics). In his survey of pseudonymous letters, Donelson brings in the Pythagorean women's letters as evidence for "... the use of mundane and realistic events as the pretended occasion for letters and as platforms for philosophical discourse" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 32–33). But Donelson does not consider how such texts might function specifically for women.

Frances Young summarizes the process of Greek *paideia* in relation to the Pastorals' teaching. She concludes that, since much education happened within the household itself, "... both the education of young children and the training of the women, whether daughters or servants, was the responsibility of the wife of the head of the household."⁷² Within the Pastorals, this means that "... there are hierarchical relationships among the women of the household, and women should both set an example to and teach the women lower down the hierarchy."⁷³ Young's concise description helpfully suggests the kind of teaching and learning process envisioned for women by the Pastorals, but she does not compare this program with that found in the Pythagorean letters.

Another view of women's education in the Pastorals is given by Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, who characterize the process as: "... the inter-generational family activity whereby women in traditional societies convey wisdom and practical knowledge from mother to daughter and surrogate mother to surrogate daughter."⁷⁴ Although this depiction seems not to correlate much with Greco-Roman philosophy, Osiek and Balch nonetheless propose some of the Pythagorean women's texts as a "possible documented precedent" to the teaching program for women outlined in Titus 2:3–5, 1 Tim 4:7 and 5:1–16.⁷⁵

⁷² *Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 82.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁷⁴ *Families in the New Testament World*, 165.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 168. Here they mention Theano, Periktione, Phintys, and Melissa (but not Myia) as female writers with a teaching agenda. Balch mentions the Pastorals in passing in *Let Wives Be Submissive*, and one of the chief contributions of his monograph is the attention paid to the sources on household economics, including the Pythagorean women's texts (these latter are noted at: *ibid.*, 56–58, 84, 89, 97, 101, 114 n. 75). The Pythagorean sources are also cited, but not systematically engaged, in Balch's overview: "Neopythagorean Moralists and the New Testament Household Codes," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.26.1 (1992): 380–411; the women's texts appear at 398, 400, 404–406. Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald devote two pages to these Pythagorean writings, summarizing some of their contents (by recourse to Meunier's French translation; *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006], 148–149; they also note Myia's letter, *ibid.*, 100). Some other Pastorals scholarship simply mentions the Neopythagorean women in passing, e.g., Spicq cites Phintys (*Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 392, 399 n. 3) and Periktione (415 n. 5), but none of the letters from Pythagorean women; Johnson notes Phintys and Periktione (*Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 135). Bassler names "some Neopythagorean treatises" (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, 195); Collins refers to Plutarch's mention of Theano (1 & 2 Timothy and Titus, 69); Fiore names Phintys (*Pastoral Epistles*, 65). Scholars who make no mention of the Pythagorean texts so far as I can tell are: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*; Verner, *Household of God*; Quinn, *Letter to Titus*; F.M. Young, *Theology of the Pastoral Letters*; Quinn and Wacker, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*; Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*.

Bruce W. Winter draws heavily upon moral-philosophical sources in his effort to understand the roles of women in the “Pauline communities” (which for him include the recipients of the Pastorals).⁷⁶ His *Roman Wives, Roman Widows* makes more use than most of the treatise by Phintys, and the letters *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Euboule*.⁷⁷ In my view, Winter is certainly correct to say “there are invaluable letters [meaning the two just mentioned] that preserve *teaching* concerning the modest wife.”⁷⁸ Because his analysis does not show the philosophical roots or the gender perspective of such teaching, however, it falls short of providing a comprehensive context for the Pastorals’ instructions for and about women.

In an essay “The *Virtus Feminarum* in 1 Timothy 2:9–15,” Abraham J. Malherbe links *sōphrosynē* (the woman’s virtue) to both its philosophical roots and to the Pastorals. Referring to both the treatise *On the Sōphrosynē* and *Melissa to Kleareta*, he notes that “Neopythagoreans were particularly interested in the subject of women”⁷⁹ Since *sōphrosynē* is a significant virtue

(Although Towner says he is “indebted” to Winter’s *Roman Wives*, he does not himself make note of the Pythagorean texts; *ibid.*, 205, n. 39).

⁷⁶ I do not agree with Winter’s classification of “the new woman,” which he extrapolated from an essay by Elaine Fantham, “The ‘New Woman’: Representation and Reality,” in *Women in the Classical World* (eds. Fantham, H. Peet Foley, N. Boynel Kampen, Sarah B. Pomeroy, and A.H. Shapiro; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), ch. 10. Also, because Winter perceives Ephesus as the historical setting for 1 Timothy as Crete is for Titus, he uncritically uses evidence (archaeological and textual) specific to those locales and reads this back into the Pastorals (*Roman Wives*, 97, 128–130, 141–144). In fact, whenever Winter attempts to extract relevant data from Roman legal texts and historical studies, as well as from satire and other literary materials, he takes all of these at face value. For example, he states, with no further explanation: “Juvenal identified the shameful woman by means of her jewellery ...,” (*ibid.*, 104; referring to *Satire* 6.458–459). For Winter, the correspondences between “representation and reality” are clear throughout his research, so that he can claim that the philosophical schools argue “... for a view of marriage and sexual morality where men and women operated with faithfulness and integrity *against what had become a significant, alternative lifestyle for wives*” (*Roman Wives*, 74; my italics). This seems to be an obvious mirror-reading of the textual evidence. See further discussion in Chapter Five, n. 129.

⁷⁷ References to the Pythagorean women appear throughout *Roman Wives* (98, 102, 107, 121, 154, 162, 167, although these are not all indicated in the index). Winter includes translations of *Melissa to Kleareta* and part of *Theano to Euboule*, along with two sections of *On the Sōphrosynē* by Phintys (*ibid.*, 72–74; the translation of *On the Sōphrosynē* comes from Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 68, 69). He also offers a section of *On the Harmonia* by Periktione, but this is attributed only to a nameless “Neopythagorean” (*ibid.*, 162; the translation of this treatise evidently comes from Voula Lambropoulou, “Some Pythagorean Female Virtues,” in *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* [eds. Richard Hawley and Barbara Levick; London: Routledge, 1995], 126).

⁷⁸ *Roman Wives*, 72.

⁷⁹ In *Renewing Tradition*, 61.

in the Pastorals, Malherbe proposes that further questions must be asked: “Why did the author choose the conventions he did, how does he use them, and why does he use them in this way?”⁸⁰ My own investigation takes up these questions in much detail in later chapters.

Devoting more space to the Pythagorean treatises and letters than any other New Testament scholar, Ulrike Wagener rightly identifies the strong connections of their contents with the teachings about women found primarily in 1Timothy 2:9–3:1a and 5:3–16.⁸¹ Her linguistic analysis moves beyond the uncomplicated documentation of parallels. For example, regarding the words καταστολή κόσμιος, αἰδώς, and σωφροσύνη (1Tim 2:9), she argues: “Die enge Verbindung zwischen den hier verwandten Begriffen ist aber nun ebenfalls schon traditionell; der Verfasser hat also nicht Einzelbegriffe aufgenommen und neu zusammengestellt, sondern sich eines schon geprägten Vorstellungskomplexes bedient.”⁸² She finds that the Pythagorean texts ascribed to Periktione, Phintys, and Melissa all agree with the logic of the instruction on female adornment in 1Timothy 2:9.⁸³ Even more relevant for this present study, Wagener identifies the feminine ideals of the Pythagorean writings and the Pastorals as “Literarische Strategien zur Durchsetzung einer restriktiven Frauenmoral.”⁸⁴ Her perception of “literary strategies” leads into a brief discussion of the appropriate teachers for women and to a consideration of how the composers’ pseudonyms serve to authorize each epistolary corpora.⁸⁵ One significant result of utilizing female Pythagorean names as authors is that “... wird ihnen ja formal Kompetenz in praktischer Philosophie zugeschrieben.”⁸⁶ By means of such suggestive comments on the philosophical context of and literary contacts between the Pythagorean texts and the Pastoral Letters, Wagener sets the stage for a more comprehensive examination of their moral advice for women.

Finally, J.E. Taylor poses one more invitation for further research into Greco-Roman theories of feminine virtue. When setting the limits of her project on Philo’s “Therapeutae,” she states: “I generally omit Christian women from the survey of [women philosophers], since the question of whether they were conceptualized in philosophical terms deserves a large

⁸⁰ Ibid., 65.

⁸¹ *Die Ordnung*, 81–85, 88–92, 123 n. 44, 127 n. 59, 156, 176 n. 53.

⁸² Ibid., 82.

⁸³ Ibid., 84, 88, 89.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 89.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 90–92.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 91.

study in its own right.”⁸⁷ The present project seeks to meet at least part of that need by investigating the Pastorals’ teachings for and about women in close comparison with the letters attributed to Pythagorean female philosophers.

This dissertation draws upon such scholarly examinations, primarily those from the field of historical-criticism. While I ask some similar research questions about these letters, these are then applied to the specific statements about female virtue and conduct. How does the composition of pseudepigraphic letters impinge on *the women* in their intended audience? Who is appointed to teach the believing *female learners*? How do moral examples function *for women*? How are epistolary paraenetic elements employed *for women*? How are the opponents characterized with respect *to women*? What moral virtue is exhorted *for women*? How does the author utilize his theological beliefs to provide justification for his instructions *about women* in his communities? By pursuing such questions, I elaborate a cohesive and expansive interpretation of the Pastorals’ instructional ideals for women.

A CURRICULUM FOR FEMALE PHILOSOPHERS

While ancient philosophical movements concentrated most of their efforts on the education of elite males in Greek and Roman culture, my survey of the literature shows that women, too, were thought to require guidance for how their lives could contribute properly to the larger social context. In that effort, the pedagogical strategies employed by the philosophers take the form of an integrated course of study—in short, what may be viewed as a *curriculum*.

One modern, but appropriate, definition of curriculum comes from the educator Franklin Bobbitt: “As applied to education, it is that *series of things which children and youth must do and experience* by way of developing abilities to do the things well that make up the affairs of adult life; and to be in all respects what adults should be.”⁸⁸ He proposed that a curriculum be based on:

⁸⁷ *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 175.

⁸⁸ *The Curriculum* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1918), 42; his italics. The original Latin meaning was of a race-course (from the verb *currere*). The first documented English use for *curriculum* as a course of study comes from the University of Glasgow in the 1630s. What I am calling a “curriculum” will also be described here as “moral education,” “educational program/process,” “course of study,” etc. Modern thinkers might also think of this kind of moral education as a type of “socialization.” To socialize is “To make fit for companionship

... the total range of habits, skills, abilities, forms of thought, valuations, ambitions, etc., that its members need for the effective performance of their vocational labors; likewise, the total range needed for their *civic activities*; their health activities; their recreations; their language; their parental, religious, and *general social activities* It will be wide as life itself.⁸⁹

Bobbitt's curriculum for such a communal human life—with its political, economic, familial, artistic, and religious elements—is as broad as the curricular subject matter conceived by classical philosophy, as seen in its writings on ethics, law and politics, rhetoric, household management, agriculture, parenting and other familial duties, and many aspects of friendship and social relations.

Yet it is not just these topics that indicate the presence of a curriculum for women in the philosophical literature. First, the authors and their texts show that their historical context is that of a well-known teaching/learning process. Therefore, when examining these texts, we may fairly ask: who are the teachers; by what techniques might they communicate the material? Who are the learners; in what ways might they practice what has been taught? Second, by composing some sort of written manuscript each author has provided curricular “textbooks” that he or she hopes will advance the educational program. Thus, we can seek to know: how will the texts convey and support the overall objectives of the teachers? This, then, is how I conceive of the ancient moral-philosophical curriculum for women: a course of study that brings together teachers (and how they teach), learners (and how they learn), subject matter, and textual resources into one integrated program of lifelong learning intended specifically for women.

with others; make sociable. To convert or adapt to the needs of society” (*American Heritage Dictionary*).

⁸⁹ *The Curriculum*, 43; my italics. These objectives are not at all alien to Greek *paideia* (later adopted and adapted by the Romans), with its goal of creating cultured individuals able to take up their proper roles in society. Werner Wilhelm Jaeger defines *paideia* as “... the process of educating man into his true form, the real and genuine human nature. That is the true Greek *paideia*, adopted by the Roman statesman as a model The ideal of human character which they wished to educate each individual to attain was not an empty abstract pattern, existing outside of time and space” (*Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture; Vol. 1, Archaic Greece: the Mind of Athens*, [trans. Gilbert Highet (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed. 1945)], xxiv–xxv). Jaeger continues: “The man revealed in the work of the great Greeks is a political man. Greek education is not the sum of a number of private arts and skills intended to create a perfect independent personality” (ibid., xxv–xxvi). A later historical study of ancient *paideia* which includes a chapter on “Women and Education,” is Raffaella Cribiore’s *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 74–101.

The findings of this project depend upon close, comparative readings of the Pythagorean and Pastoral letters, which are accomplished by means of historical-critical methods. My comparisons are based on: (1) the text history of each corpus, which leads into a discussion of its intended audience and setting as well as evidence for pseudepigraphy; (2) thorough examinations of the functions of the authorial pseudonyms; (3) detailed analyses of the rhetorical aims and argumentation of these instructional letters; and (4) cultural and historical contextualization of the epistolary forms and contents. Throughout this investigation, the interpretive lens of a “curriculum for the moral education of women” is used as an instrument for synthesizing the discrete instructional elements represented in and by the letters into an integrated whole.

When the Pastorals’ curricular project is viewed within the wider context of other Greco-Roman moral-philosophical advice for women, especially as exemplified by the Pythagorean women’s letters, we find that the author has composed a distinctively Paulinist adaptation of such training in female morality. That his pseudepigraphical compositions were authorized as letters from the apostle only increased their influence among later Christian writers and communities. Indeed, the strong correspondences between his general curriculum and other moral-philosophical instruction anticipate and lead into the similar efforts of highly literate early church leaders such as Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. They also attempted to integrate their pagan educational experiences with what they had learned of Christian theology, including the contents of the Pastoral Letters. At around the same time, the Pastorals’ restrictions on women were questioned and disagreed with by Christian movements that promoted leadership roles and/or ascetic practices for women, such as the Montanists, the persons behind the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, and some forms of Gnosticism. Needless to say, the successful pseudepigraphy of the Pastorals’ author made possible the inclusion of his letters in the New Testament canon, so his “orthodox” position won out. It has subsequently influenced not only the lives of individual women but also the development of Western civilization for many centuries.

PART ONE

THE PYTHAGOREAN WOMEN'S LETTERS

Part One presents the evidence for my claim that the letters attributed to Pythagorean women represent an ancient curriculum for the moral-philosophical training of women. Keeping in mind the elements of such an educational program, my analysis demonstrates:

- (1) since these text-artifacts survive in the form of moral-philosophical letters and, in particular, in the aggregated form of letter collection(s), they may be read as *textual resources* for the moral instruction of women;
- (2) the pseudonymous senders of the letters serve as exemplary older female *teachers*, with the named recipients as their younger female *learners*;
- (3) certain types, styles and aims of classical rhetoric are adapted as *instructional methodologies* put to use within an epistolary framework; and
- (4) the constructed epistolary occasions provide the *subject matter* thought to be necessary for good women to learn, which takes up elements of “the good woman” *topos*.

The extensive interplay between the topics, pseudonyms, and text production of individual letters and their arrangements in letter collection(s) makes any thorough interpretation of the Pythagorean women’s corpus quite complex. The elements of epistolary analysis, looking at form, pseudonymy, style, and subject matter must be addressed, but the necessity of examining each letter on its own merits strains against the historical collectivity of the letters as the interpretive context. Based on the extant evidence not one of these five letters is intended to be read alone, yet each needs to be investigated separately in order to show how it interrelates to the others. The structure of Part One reveals my two intentions: to analyze the letters as independent texts and, at the same time, to examine them as component parts of a larger group. Ultimately it is in this collected form that I identify the letters themselves as “textual resources” for the moral education of women. Chapter One delineates the transmission history of the letters within their collections and posits some strategies for reading such a composite textual form. In the second part of Chapter One, the letters are translated in their most commonly found collective sequence. In Chapter Two, I evaluate the roles of the implied authors as teachers by presenting attestations to the female Pythagorean pseudonyms, and by analyzing the educational functions of the epistolary authorial names as a means of establishing the role of older women teaching younger women. Chapters Three and Four separate the corpus into its individual texts, providing in the former my analyses of the epistolary teaching strategies, and in the latter, an investigation of the instructional contents of each letter.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PYTHAGOREAN LETTER COLLECTION

For centuries, programs of education have utilized written texts as instructional tools: to impart information, explain concepts, and lay out examples. Such sources serve as the basis for common discussion; students may keep them close at hand for reference and reminder. Textual resources not only extend the teaching process beyond the classroom by rehearsing the subject matter under consideration; they also replicate the role of a teacher by means of the authorial voice. As with anthologies or multi-chapter textbooks today, a written collection of sources may be especially suitable for a course of study because it allows for covering a greater number of topics and for presenting the subject from differing perspectives. In these aspects, many ancient philosophical letters are appropriately viewed as textual resources: (1) they seek to convey to their readership the contents of how to live the good life; (2) they speak in the authoritative voice of a philosophical leader or movement; and (3) when these letters appear as collections, they offer multiple angles from which the audience may consider the subject matter. Such is the case with the letter collection attributed to female Pythagorean authors which, under the names of renowned women, explicitly describe the ways in which women ought to develop as moral individuals.

Emerging from the Hellenistic interest in and revival of Pythagoreanism, these five letters—*Melissa to Kleareta* (MK), *Myia to Phyllis* (MPh), *Theano to Euboule* (ThE), *Theano to Nikostrate* (ThN), and *Theano to Kallisto* (ThK)—share a tightly-connected textual history.¹ Yet this linkage has not previously been recognized as significant, in part because modern scholarship first examines these letters individually and then interprets them in conjunction with the treatises attributed to the Pythagorean women Periktione (*On the Harmony of a Woman* and *On Wisdom*) and Phintys (*On the Sôphrosynê of a Woman*).² While the subject matter of the treatises assists in

¹ This text history of the Pythagorean women's letters relies heavily on Städele, *Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer*.

² Besides being dated earlier (3rd c. BCE) than the letters, the treatises attributed to the Pythagorean women Periktione (*On the Harmony of a Woman* and *On Wisdom*) and Phintys

understanding the worldview of the letters, the letter collection under consideration functions as an instructional resource in distinctive and important ways.

As will be shown below, each of these five texts takes a clearly recognizable, typical epistolary form, with sender, recipient, and either an opening or closing greeting, along with first- and second-person references.³ Yet, what is most distinctive about the letters as artifacts is that in all the codex manuscripts (even in one fragmentary papyrus scroll from the third–fourth century CE)⁴ each letter never appears alone but always with at least one other letter of the group. Furthermore, several elements of their arrangement are quite stable by the time the codices are being produced.

THE CODEX TRADITION

The earliest extant codex manuscript that contains all five Pythagorean women's letters is *Harleianus* 5610, variously dated from 1200 to the early fourteenth century CE.⁵ All five letters then appear in twenty-two fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts,⁶ often being found with letters and

(*On the Sôphrosynê of a Woman*) have an entirely separate text history, being transmitted in the *Anthologium* of Stobaeus, which contains none of the letters by Pythagorean women. (Stobaeus' sources did however contain both chreiai and a short text attributed to Theano, which I discuss in my analysis of her name.) The two authorial names of the treatises are not linked to the three pseudonymous authors of the letters in any ancient document. The first scholar to bring them together under the label of "Pythagorean women philosophers" is Gilles Ménage in the seventeenth century (*The History of Women Philosophers* [trans. Beatrice H. Zedler; Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984], 47–62). A generation or so later, Johan Christian Wolf includes the literature attributed to all these Pythagorean women in his *Mulierum Graecarum Quae Oratione Prosae Usae Sunt Fragmenta et Elogia Graece et Latina* (Hamburg: Vandenhoeck, 1735). He positions all of his sources in alphabetical order by authorial name; thus, Melissa's letter is followed by that from Myia (130–136), and Periktione's treatise fragments are followed by those of Phintys (190–200), with the various texts and chreiai ascribed to Theano appearing last (214–248). Interspersed are writings from other "Greek Women." This is the same sequencing subsequently used by Thesleff (*An Introduction and Pythagorean Texts*).

³ Many of these elements of the epistolary genre will be further analyzed in Chapter Two (on the function of authorial pseudonyms) and in Chapter Three (where I examine the rhetorical strategies used in each letter).

⁴ Even though this document is earlier than the codices, it is more helpful to consider its evidence after explaining the later manuscript tradition, as will be seen.

⁵ Of course, *Harl.* 5610 is derived from prior sources, standing in what Städele designates as "Familie β" (*Die Briefe*, 40).

⁶ I have examined a few of these manuscripts: *Harl.* 5610 and 5635, held by the British Library, as well as *Ms. Chicago* 103 (olim Ry.9) at the Newberry Library in Chicago.

other texts by male philosophers.⁷ Further examination of the women's letters in these manuscripts shows that two smaller collections—a two-letter collection (always in the order *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis* [MM], and never one without the other) and a three-letter collection (always in the order *Theano to Euboule*, *Theano to Nikostrate*, and *Theano to Kallisto* [TH₃])—are most often combined into a five-letter composite collection. The letters of Melissa and Myia are most often *followed* by all three letters by Theano, but occasionally *preceded* by them, which leads to two forms of the composite collection. The information is collated in the chart below:

Table A: Pythagorean Letter Collection

Order of Letters	Number of Manuscripts
Composite A: MM → TH ₃ ⁸	17
Composite B: TH ₃ → MM ⁹	3
TH ₃ → XX → MM ¹⁰	2
TH ₃ ¹¹	6

The varying placement of TH₃ can be explained on the basis that these letters form a small collection of their own, since none of these three letters is ever transmitted singly in the codices.¹² The assumption of a separate “Theano-collection” is supported by the fact that these three letters

⁷ As one example of the range of other authors included, the manuscript in Chicago contains: Alciphron, Melissa, Myia, Theano, Hippocrates, Heraclitus, Diogenes, Crates, and Aeschines. The table of contents lists Theano's letters as beginning on page 64. Melissa's letter is contained on 63^{r-v}, with Myia's letter immediately following, 63^v–64^v. Note that in general the letters are not classified by their philosophical schools.

⁸ This composite order is presented by these manuscripts: *Bononiensis* 3563; *Ms. Chicago* 103; *Laurentianus Gr.* 57.12; *Laurentianus Gr.* 57.45; *Laurentianus Gr. Conventi Soppressi* 153; *Palatinus Gr.* 132; *Harleianus* 5610; *Matritensis* 4557 (olim 19); *Neapolitanus* III.AA.15 (= 218); *Mazarineus Gr.* 4454 (= 4, olim 611A); *Parisinus Gr.* 3021; *Parisinus Gr.* 3050; *Parisinus Gr. Suppl.* 205; *Vaticanus Gr.* 1353; *Vaticanus Gr.* 1354; *Marcianus Gr.* 609; and *Vindobonensis phil. Gr. Suppl.* 179.

⁹ This order appears in: *Vaticanus Gr.* 1461; *Palatinus Gr.* 419; and *Reginensis Gr.* 139.

¹⁰ Here XX represents texts from another author inserted between the women's sub-collections. According to Städele, in *Vaticanus Gr.* 1467 (dated 15th–16th c.), it is texts by Musonius, in this arrangement: TH₃ 126^r–131^r, Musonius, MK 135^v–136^v, MPh 136^v–137^v. In *Harl.* 5635 (15th c.), the order is: TH₃ 109^r–113^v, the letters of Apollonius of Tyana, MK 127^{r-v} and MPh 127^v–128^v.

¹¹ See n. 13 below.

¹² Städele summarizes the evidence: “Die Briefe der *Melissa und Myia* sind stets als Paar und nie gesondert von den Theanobriefen ... überliefert, die wiederum in einer Handschriftenfamilie, ψ , isoliert auftreten” (*Die Briefe*, 67). But see my discussion below of *P.Haun.* II.13, which has part of only one letter from Theano.

appear in six manuscripts that do not contain the Melissa-Myia collection at all,¹³ as well as their being separated from *MM* by other texts in two manuscripts.¹⁴

In sum, the evidence indicates that by the time renewed interest in ancient Greek texts led to their being copied by hand,¹⁵ the five letters most often form a composite collection, built upon two smaller collections: *MM* (a pair of letters in set order) and *TH₃* (a trio of letters also in an established order, appearing apart from *MM* six times). Composite A (*MM* → *TH₃*) is extant in seventeen manuscripts, while Composite B (*TH₃* → *MM*) occurs three times, with two anomalous instances where one other author's texts are inserted between *TH₃* and *MM*.

Determine the ordering principles behind each sub-collection (*MM* and *TH₃*) as well as for Composite Collections A and B is complicated. Beginning with *MM*, it is probable that *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis* were placed together because both were composed in the Doricized Greek thought to be typical of authentic Pythagorean writings,¹⁶ as well as because both were attributed to female senders and treat topics appropriate for women. The letters are also placed in (Greek) alphabetical order by the authors' names, but this is slim evidence with only two names at hand; likewise, with only two letters, their relative length is useless as a criterion.¹⁷ In sum, the rationale for collecting *MM* appears to be based on the criteria of language, authorship, and contents.

With respect to the collection *TH₃*, we have, of course, three letters attributed to one author,¹⁸ but they are not arranged alphabetically by their

¹³ These are: *Mutinensis Gr.* 54 (15th c.), *Leidensis Vossianus Gr.* Q 51 (15th c.), *Laurentianus Gr.* 55.2 (15th c.), *Vindobonensis phil.Gr.* 59 (15th c.), *Ambrosianus* 348 (1462), *Parisinus Gr.* 3054 (15th c. ex.?). (On page 136, n. 3, Städele appears to have omitted one of the six mss., *Vindobonensis phil. Gr.* 59, that contains the letters of Theano, but not those of Melissa and Myia.)

¹⁴ See n. 10 above.

¹⁵ The history of copying Greek manuscripts in Renaissance Italy is explained by L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 122–163. According to Reynolds and Wilson, the mechanized-printing of texts in Greek came later than Latin texts due to the difficulties of font design and a lower demand for Greek sources, since the Greek language was less well known in the West (*ibid.*, 154–155).

¹⁶ Thesleff provides a lengthy consideration of Doric forms in pseudo-Pythagorean texts (*An Introduction*, 72, 77–92). I discuss the Doricized Greek of *MM* in the translation section.

¹⁷ *Melissa to Kleareta* (26+ lines in Städele's edition) is shorter than *Myia to Phyllis* (34+ lines).

¹⁸ A single manuscript, *Vaticanus Gr.* 578, dated to the 16th century, contains four other letters attributed to Theano, but none of these correspond to the letters in *TH₃*. The name

recipients' names¹⁹ nor by their relative length. The longest of the three letters is *Theano to Nikostrate* (66 + lines) which stands second (not first or last) in *TH₃*.²⁰ Some evidence about the collection process may be taken from the title that usually precedes the letters: "Letters of Theano concerning the raising of children" (ἐπιστολαὶ θεανοῦς περὶ τέκνων ἀνατροφῆς),²¹ even though only the first letter deals with that topic.²² Another curious fact of the collection *TH₃* is that the first two letters include χαίρειν in the prescript but give no closing formula, while in the third letter, *Theano to Kallisto*, the situation is reversed: there is no χαίρειν but a farewell salutation—ἔρρωσο—serves to close the entire collection.²³ We can only assume that earlier in the history of this collection a scribe modified (or added?) these aids to reading (and copying) and that this act established the sequence even more firmly in the tradition. Thus, when the pre-arranged collection *TH₃* was at some point joined to *MM* in both Composites A and B, no changes were made to its internal sequence.²⁴

"Theano" is mentioned only in the title (not in any epistolary prescript) of this manuscript: ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς τινὰς τῆς σοφωτάτης Θεανοῦς. Städele suggests that some copyist attributed the letters to Theano because the first one here (*Theano to Eurydike*) covers the same topic as *Theano to Nikostrate*: a wife's grief over her husband's association with a *hetaira* (*Die Briefe*, 333, n. 3).

¹⁹ Thesleff has published Theano's letters in such an order, taking no account of their transmission history (*Introduction and Pythagorean Texts*); see also n. 24 below.

²⁰ *Theano to Euboule* is the shortest of the three at 43 lines, with *Theano to Kallisto* coming in at 44+ lines. It is theoretically possible that the original composer simply wrote the letters in this order which has survived the long years of transmission.

²¹ In *Ms. Chicago* 103 this title is written in red ink on a separate line above the epistolary prescript: Θεανῶ Εὐβούλῃ χαίρειν (also in red ink).

²² Some copyist must have taken a cue from the first position of *Theano to Euboule*. But then, as Städele continues: "Der 'Vorspann' ist also nicht ursprünglich. Vor den Grußformeln des zweiten [*Theano to Nikostrate*] und dritten [*Theano to Kallisto*] Briefes erfolgt jeweils die Richtigstellung durch neue Beschreibung des Inhalts" (*Die Briefe*, 252, n. 3). In *Ms. Chicago* 103, the "corrected" title for *Theano to Nikostrate* reads πρὸς τὴν ζηλοτυπούσαν παραμυθητική, "Consolation for a woman who is jealous," and for *Theano to Kallisto*, θεανοῦς καλλιστοῖ περὶ θεραπαίνων προστασίας ὑποθετική, "Exhortation from Theano to Kallisto about supervision of female-slaves"; cf. also, Städele, *Die Briefe*, 252.

²³ This ἔρρωσο would thus close both the smaller collection *TH₃*, as well as the Composite Collection A. There is no similar ending for *Myia to Phyllis*, the second letter of *MM*, and the last letter in Composite B.

²⁴ In fact, perhaps here relative length became part of the decision, for Composite A now moves from the shortest letter (*Melissa to Kleareta*), to the second shortest (*Myia to Phyllis*), and then to the longer collection of *TH₃* (although this is three letters, not one). This explains why an alphabetical ordering does not apply for all of Composite A. As Städele points out, the problem with assuming an order based on the influence of the Latin alphabet is that "die Reihenfolge der Autoren eben auch dem lateinischen Alphabet nicht consequent

Another explanation for the sequence of the letters in Composite A ($MM \rightarrow TH_3$) arises from their connection with a letter ascribed to another Pythagorean: *Lysis to Hipparchos*.²⁵ In twelve out of seventeen manuscripts containing Composite A, this letter directly precedes those ascribed to the women, forming an even larger collection of six Pythagorean letters. The significance of *Lysis to Hipparchos* is that it, too, is written in the Doricized Greek found in both *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*. The first three letters in these manuscripts would then have found their position due to

folgt" (*Die Briefe*, 68). Städele critiques two widely-used editions of Pythagorean texts obscure the transmission history of the women's letters: Rudolf Hercher's edition implies "zusammengefaßten Briefen um ein geschlossenes Corpus" (ibid., 29), referring to Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci: Recensuit, recognovit, adnotatione critica et indicibus instruxit Rudolphus Hercher* (Paris: Didot, 1873), 601–608. Unfortunately, that of Thesleff (*Pythagorean Texts*) "stellt zumindest in dieser Hinsicht keinen Fortschritt dar" (*Die Briefe*, 30). Thesleff has simply placed the diverse Pythagorean texts in English alphabetical order by the name of the pseudonymous author, a disposition that never occurs in the manuscripts, so that *Melissa to Kleareta* is separated from *Myia to Phyllis* by texts from the men Metopos and Milon, among others. (A similar choppy sequencing pertains in Wolf's *Mulierum Graecarum Quae Oratione Prosaе Usae Sunt Fragmenta et Elogia Graece et Latina* [Hamburg: Vandenhoeck, 1735], where the letters are included with other writings by women and placed in Latin alphabetical order. There, Myia's letter follows that of Melissa, but both are separated from the letters of Theano by ninety pages.) In addition, Thesleff further disrupts the order of the letters that are attributed to Theano by placing them in English alphabetical order by the name of the recipient. He has thus interspersed the letters in TH_3 with the four letters from *Vat. Gr.* 578. Other translations and comments on the letters that follow Thesleff are plagued by these irregularities, including Waithé, ed., *A History of Women Philosophers*; and Plant, ed., *Women Writers*.

²⁵ *Lysis to Hipparchos* is sequenced with Composite A of the women's letters, in the order $Lysis \rightarrow MM \rightarrow TH_3$, in one manuscript family (Städele's family β). Composite B of the women's letters appears with the *Lysis*-letter in two out of three manuscripts (*Vaticanus Gr.* 1461, and *Reginensis Gr.* 139), but there other texts are interspersed as well. Further, *Lysis* appears once in a manuscript that also contains TH_3 (*Leidensis Vossianus Gr.* Q 51), but again the letters are separated by texts from other authors. One other manuscript (*Vaticanus* 1467) contains both *Lysis* and the women's letters in this order: TH_3 , then the letters of Musonius, *MM*, *Lysis* (see n. 9). In general, *Lysis to Hipparchos* is more commonly found than the women's letters, being transmitted thirty-five times, in both families α and β . Städele's charts detail this evidence (*Die Briefe*, 66–67, 77, 103; also, his *stemma codicum* of *Lysis to Hipparchos*, 135–136). The letter of *Lysis* addresses the need to maintain discretion in communicating Pythagoras' teaching, and invokes Pythagorean rituals of purification. It dates to the second half of the third century BCE, and "probably owes its popularity chiefly to the circumstances that it pretends to offer an inside view of the Pythagorean community" (Christoph Riedweg, *Pythagoras: His Life, Teaching, and Influence*; trans. Steven Rendall, in collaboration with Christoph Riedweg and Andreas Schatzmann [Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 2002], 120). Kathleen Freeman's work gives a little more information on the fifth-century *Lysis*, a member of the Taurentine center of Pythagoreanism (*The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Companion to Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* [3rd ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953], 74, 77, 78 n. 1, 220–221, 233).

their dialect (and, possibly, they were placed in either Greek or Latin alphabetical order by author's name),²⁶ with the letters of the famous Pythagorean Theano appended.

Why Theano's letters were attached here, while the letter ascribed to her husband Pythagoras²⁷ was not, deserves some further consideration. Städele suggests that a chronological framework (based on the times of the authors) may have been used for arranging the letters but notes that this has been broken by associations of the subject matter of various Pythagorean letters. He sees this in the relationship of *Pythagoras to Hieron* and the letters of Phalaris,²⁸ but this idea also seems to me to explain the proximate positions of the women's letters. If an editor was working under the influence of chronological ordering, this would recommend placing the letters by the married couple Pythagoras and Theano near to each other. However, since her letters deal with "feminine" topics, that is, with women's roles in marriage, child-rearing, and household management, it might have been more attractive to link them topically to the *Melissa-Myia* collection instead.

Moreover, the stable orderings within the small collections *MM* and *TH*₃, as well as those found in both Composite A and Composite B, are based on the unmistakably distinctive feature that all five letters identify women as both senders and recipients of the correspondence. As Städele states:

Von den über 1500 Briefen und Brieffragmenten, die Hercher in seiner Ausgabe der griechischen Epistolographen für die Autoren Aelian bis Zenon zusammengetragen hat, sind nur verschwindend wenige angeblich von Frauen geschrieben oder an Frauen gerichtet. Noch wesentlich seltener ist zugleich eine Frau Verfasserin, eine andere Empfängerin Um so singulärer ist die Stellung der drei Pythagoreerinnen Melissa, Myia, Theano im Rahmen der griechischen Epistolographie.²⁹

²⁶ Within this three-letter sub-collection of Doricized letters, the criterion of length is not in effect: *Lysis* is by far the longest, at 66+ lines, *Melissa to Kleareta* the shortest (26+), with *Myia to Phyllis* (34+) in the middle. This gives additional evidence that *Melissa* and *Myia* were joined together because of their "female" qualities.

²⁷ The letter *Pythagoras to Hieron* shows no special connection to any of the six Pythagorean letters thus far discussed.

²⁸ *Die Briefe*, 68.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 251. Städele adds: "In der Regel handelt es sich hierbei um fingierte Hetärenbriefe, die für verschiedene Sammlungen angefertigt wurden, etwa für die des Alkiphron oder des Theophylaktos Simokattes Selbst Philosophinnen wie Hipparchia ... oder Hypatia ... treten nur als Adressatinnen in Erscheinung" (*ibid.*). For further discussion of Alciphron's letters of *hetairai*, see Patricia A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 264–273; and *Ancient Greek Literary Letters: Selections in Translation* (London; New York: Routledge, 2006), 130–135, 147–157. The position of the five letters attributed to Melissa, Myia, and Theano is no less unique today than it was

Surely the remarkable appearance of the female names themselves must have suggested a gathering together of these letters to any copyist who had them at hand.

Even though no single ordering principle can be determined for the women's letters in their small and composite groupings within the manuscript tradition, clearly the reasons behind the collections themselves depend upon at least these three factors: (1) their Pythagorean associations (Doric dialect and famous Pythagorean names); (2) their treatment of women's issues as subject matter; and (3) their correspondents being women.

PAPYRUS HAUNIENSIS II.13³⁰

Since the publication of Städele's edition, new textual evidence for the letters by Pythagorean women has materialized in the form of a papyrus document, *Papyrus Hauniensis* II.13, dated by its editor to the third century CE.³¹ The letter *Melissa to Kleareta* and the first lines of *Theano to Euboule* are written on the *verso* of the papyrus, while the *recto* records an unpublished "official document."³² While *Melissa to Kleareta* opens here with a typical

in the Greco-Roman era when they were composed, or during the Renaissance when classical philosophical texts were recovered and re-copied.

³⁰ In this section, I build upon my essay "Advice to the Bride: Moral Exhortation for Young Wives in Two Ancient Letter Collections," in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (eds. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity; Library of Second Temple Studies 70; London; New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 232–247.

³¹ Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, ed. and trans., *Papyri Graecae Haunienesis, Vol. 2: "Letters and mummy labels from Roman Egypt"* (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1981), 1–3. The exact provenance is unknown. Raffaella Cribiore briefly perused a digital image of this papyrus and suggested an early fourth-century CE date: "I can tell you that the hand of *P.Haun. 13* is a semi-literary hand excellent in terms of legibility. I would date it to the beginning of the fourth century. Since the roll clearly preserved a collection of letters, it is not a teacher's model. Models are always not so extensive. This scribe is very capable but it is difficult to say if he produced a book for a private library (a scholar's perhaps) or if this type of letters was used in philosophical schools (I kind of doubt it). Women certainly did not reach that level of education and for the vast majority of women reading this papyrus would have been almost impossible" (email correspondence, dated March 7, 2007). Since the papyrus was published in 1981, it was not available for Städele's edition, so that Bülow-Jacobsen's comments on the relationship between the papyrus and the later manuscript tradition are very helpful.

³² This designation comes from Bülow-Jacobsen. *Papyri*, 1. The upper right hand corner on the *verso* is broken off, and the letter of *Melissa* has been written on what remains available, so it appears that this was a piece of recycled papyrus. There is no *kollesis*, so the editor assumes

epistolary prescript: μέλισσα κλεαρέτη χαίρειν, there is no formal ending to the letter, such as ἔρρωσο.³³ However, the ending of this letter and beginning of the next is signaled first by a forked *paragraphus* followed by an “enlarged theta” for Theano’s name in the prescript of that letter: θεανῶ εὐβούλῃ χαίρειν.³⁴ With the addition of these few lines from *Theano to Euboule*, the papyrus text provides the earliest evidence of the collecting of the Pythagorean women’s letters.

As stated above, in all of the Renaissance manuscripts *Melissa to Kleareta* is written in a Doricized Greek.³⁵ A word-for-word comparison of the texts shows that in *P.Haun.* II.13 those Doricisms are consistently represented by Koiné forms of the same words.³⁶ The text also shows that Koiné words have been substituted for some of the more unusual Doric forms.³⁷ It certainly seems more likely that the Doricized text of the later manuscripts is prior to this Koiné papyrus version, since one can more easily conceive of a copyist changing the less familiar Doric into a more usual Koiné rather than the other way around. This means that the Doric version offers the *more difficult reading*. Furthermore, each addition or change to Koiné in the papyrus can be explained as a *lectio facilior*, in Bülow-Jacobsen’s phrasing, that would assist the reading of the letter by a later audience.³⁸ Another noteworthy difference is that the papyrus text is about ten percent longer than the later manuscripts (roughly 240 versus 212 words), since in *P.Haun.* II.13 there are

that this document was originally a scroll (ibid.). Neither *Melissa to Kleareta* nor *Theano to Euboule* has been found in any other papyrus documents. *P.Haun.* II.13 is not included in the recent volume of letters from “real” women by Roger Bagnall and Raffaella Cribiore, with contributions by Evie Ahtaridi, *Women’s Letters from Ancient Egypt, 300 B.C.–(A.D. 800* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006).

³³ Again, there is no closing greeting to this letter in the codices either.

³⁴ The first letters of the names Melissa, Kleareta, and Euboule are not similarly capitalized. However, the upper-right line of the κ of κλεαρέτη extends in a flourish over the -λεα- of that name.

³⁵ For example, using alpha instead of eta in many feminine forms (τάν for τήν, ψυχᾶς for ψυχῆς), among other distinctive forms.

³⁶ I count more than seventy small differences in this category.

³⁷ For instance, τελειοῦσθαι, “to become perfect,” takes the place of πολιοῦσθαι, “to grow gray,” in line 8. I point out further changes in the translation notes.

³⁸ *Papyri*, 10. E.A. Judge states: “In the case of Melissa we are apparently dealing with the modernisation of the text by an editor, which must surely imply that it would be more effectively communicated in the *koiné*. Was this an advantage for women in particular? John Chrysostom once switched from Attic to the *koiné* when a woman complained she could only follow the half of what he said (Zgusta, op.cit., p. 130)” (“A Woman’s Behavior,” in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 6 [1992]: 23; citing L. Zgusta in G. Neumann and J. Untermann, eds., *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit* [Cologne 1980], 124).

nine additions that do not appear in the Doric text³⁹ along with a few less significant and shorter omissions.⁴⁰ Therefore, in the case of almost all the textual differences the Doric version found in the Renaissance manuscripts is the *shorter reading*. These text-critical principles serve to establish the version of *Melissa to Kleareta* in *P.Haun.* II.13 as a copy of a Koiné version of an originally Doricized letter.⁴¹

Pursuit of a neatly ordered text history of the letter collection is complicated because the letter *Myia to Phyllis*, which is later so tightly paired with *Melissa to Kleareta* is not present in *P.Haun.* II.13. Since *Melissa to Kleareta* starts at the very top of the sheet, Bülow-Jacobsen persuasively concludes there was no other text preceding it. Then, although there is no formal closing to the letter, the opening of *Theano to Euboule* is made clear by the forked *paragraphus* and the oversized *theta*, so it is probable that whoever copied this papyrus did not know of the persistent connection between the letters of Melissa and Myia. What remains is a different collection of two letters by women affiliated with Pythagoreanism. Bülow-Jacobsen considers what might have come after the few lines of *Theano to Euboule*, where the bottom of the papyrus has broken off. Assuming a roll with several columns,⁴² he speculates that the other two letters from Theano might have followed. If so, that would have offered further evidence regarding the sequencing of the letters of Theano, but of course there is no way to determine this.⁴³

The ordering of the two letters in *P.Haun.* II.13 does persist in the later manuscripts after a fashion; that is, the papyrus evidence supports the most common order of Pythagorean women's letters in the codices (Composite A)

³⁹ For example, in line 13, *P.Haun.* II.13 adds to the description of modest clothing that it ought to be "simple but not very expensive," and, in line 30, the papyrus inserts a clarification that the husband too ought to be *sōphrōn*. Again, other additions are noted with the translation.

⁴⁰ ἦμεν, line 11; καί, line 12; δὲ αὐτάν, line 30; and dropping the unusual word γλιχόμεναν, line 28.

⁴¹ The second letter in *P.Haun.* II.13, *Theano to Euboule* is not written in a Doric dialect, and, unfortunately, due to the fragmentary nature of the papyrus, comparisons with the later manuscripts yield little in the way of similarities or differences in the text.

⁴² Bülow-Jacobsen says that "the papyrus was a roll with several columns. The letter of Theano ... which begins in line 43 would run to c. 67 lines in this format and I also find it probable that the other two older Theano-letters [*Theano to Nikostrate* and *Theano to Kallisto*] were in the collection. How much more, if anything, was collected on the roll we have no means of knowing" (*Papyri*, 1).

⁴³ It would probably be helpful to examine the "official document" on the *recto* of *P.Haun.* II.13, to determine how much space that text might have required.

with Melissa's first and Theano's last. Also, the later fixed order of *TH*₃, which begins with *Theano to Euboule*, is somewhat confirmed by the fact that the same letter appears first after *Melissa to Kleareta*. That all extant copies of *Melissa to Kleareta* are transmitted along with at least one letter of Theano indicates the perduring impulse to collect the Pythagorean women's letters. However, between the copying of *P.Haun.* II.13 in the third-fourth centuries CE and the earliest humanist manuscript from the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, we have no records (in either the form of manuscripts or attestations) of these letters, so further hypotheses about the collecting and copying processes cannot be made. Yet, most importantly, *P.Haun.* II.13 reveals that Pythagorean women's letters, apparently from two different textual traditions (one Doricized and one not), were already being placed in a collection during the time of the Roman Empire.

DATING THE LETTERS

The dating of these letters, as with other Pseudopythagorean texts, has been a source of scholarly controversy.⁴⁴ Analyzing their linguistic peculiarities along with their philosophical terms and topics, Thesleff argued for dates in the third century BCE for all the Doric Pseudopythagorean texts, while Walter Burkert advocated a later and wider range from 150 BCE to 200 CE; the two scholars "compromised" on a date in the late second century BCE.⁴⁵ However, Städele favors a later date for each of the letters at hand, extending into the second century CE:

- (1) *Melissa to Kleareta* dates to between the second century BCE and the second century CE, although Städele claims "Der sprachlichen Analyse zufolge gehört er eher dem Ende dieses Zeitraums an";⁴⁶

⁴⁴ The dating of the letters also connects to the issue of whether the texts are pseudonymous, or written by some "real" Melissa, Myia, and Theano. Given that the earliest dates posited for the texts are now the second-century BCE, they cannot go back to Myia the daughter of Pythagoras, or to her mother Theano, both of whom would have lived in the late sixth and into the fifth centuries BCE. This has been an unfortunate red herring in some scholarly debates about the letters, since it was first suggested by Waithe (*A History of Women Philosophers*, vol. 1).

⁴⁵ Thesleff's dating decisions are found in his *Introduction* and *The Pythagorean Texts*. He and Burkert exchanged ideas on the dates in *Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythagorica, Lettres de Platon, Littérature Pseudépigraphique juive* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 18; Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 1972), 88–102. Balch summarizes these and other dating options in "Neopythagorean Moralists," 381–391.

⁴⁶ *Die Briefe*, 256.

- (2) he places *Myia to Phyllis* in the second century CE;⁴⁷
- (3) *Theano to Euboule* can be dated securely to the first century BCE or later, with much evidence speaking to a date in the first-second centuries CE;⁴⁸
- (4) *Theano to Nikostrate* is assigned to a similar time period;⁴⁹
- (5) based on linguistic grounds, a somewhat later date is posited for *Theano to Kallisto*, not before the second century CE.⁵⁰

The evidence of *P.Haun.* II.13, which dates to the third or fourth centuries CE, provides a *terminus ante quem* for *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Euboule*. However, unanswerable questions remain: How long would it take for a Koiné version of the former to find a place with the latter? Were all three letters by Theano already collected? Does the absence of *Myia to Phyllis* from *P.Haun.* II.13 speak to a later date for that letter, as Bülow-Jacobsen claims?⁵¹ In the end, what can be said is that all five letters emerge from the same early Imperial period as the New Testament and other early Christian literature. Eventually, the letters were also preserved by Christian scribes, which demonstrates the continuing value these texts had in Christian contexts.⁵²

⁴⁷ Ibid., 269. Städele suggests the later years of that century, because this letter's contents are so similar to the medical writings of Rufus, Galen, and Soranus, and also "der sprachliche Befund widerspricht dieser Einordnung nicht" (ibid.).

⁴⁸ Ibid., 293.

⁴⁹ Städele observes that some forms and words make a second century CE date probable (ibid., 308–309).

⁵⁰ Städele does not appear to comment on whether the three letters ascribed to Theano were all written by the same (pseudonymous) author, but his later date for *Theano to Kallisto* must mean that it, at least, was written by a different hand, perhaps taking on the "style" of the first two.

⁵¹ Bülow-Jacobsen states: "The fact ... that Myia's letter is absent from its normal place lends credibility to Städele's later dating of that letter. Either it is even later than Städele suggests and was not yet composed when the papyrus was written, or it was so recent that it had not yet found its place in the corpus. In any case I think that the papyrus supports Städele when he assigns a slightly different date and provenance to Myia's letter" (*Papyri*, 3).

⁵² Christians certainly made use of letters ascribed to Theano. Städele provides the note written by the scribe of *Vat. Gr.* 578 in his preface: "You most dignified man: although we placed the letters of Theano first, we shall not make the letters of the holy Macrina subordinate [to them]. And we have given thanks to the lengthy span of time which, having been fixed like some great chasm in the middle, has disjoined the two from one another. Indeed, they are both wise women, so that even in the prattle of the pagans, the female sex might be the object of boast, yet only one of the two (Macrina) was divinely wise, so that the abundance of grace and the gracious gift of illumination that remains might be made visible," Εἰ καὶ τῆς θεانوῦς προετάξαμεν τὰς ἐπιστολάς, σεμνότετε ἀνθρώπε, ἀλλὰ γε τὰς τῆς ὁσίας μακρίνης οὐχ ὑποτάξομεν [- αμεν 578]. τῷ χρόνῳ δὲ πολλῷ εὐχαρισάμεθα, ὅς καὶ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ὥς μέγα τι χάσμα στηριχθεὶς εἰς μέσον ἀμφοτέρως διέξευξε· καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἄμωφ σοφαί,

It is surely significant that throughout the long history of their transmission none of the letters ever appears by itself but is always accompanied by at least one other letter. The very aggregation of these texts reveals their potential to function as a set of curricular resources.

PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND

By adopting (female) *Pythagorean* pseudonyms, the “real” authors position these five letters within the larger group of pseudepigraphic texts attributed to Pythagoras and later Pythagoreans.⁵³ Interest in the great man’s philosophical movement did not end with his death; rather, the fascination with and usefulness of his thought and practice⁵⁴ led to new forms of Pythagoreanism, including the composition of texts which are now labeled “Neopythagorean” and/or “Pseudopythagorean.”⁵⁵ The letters under consideration here are Pythagorean in that they bear the names of women from that school, but also because their concentration on household management *topoi* corresponds to other Neopythagorean texts (ascribed to male authors) that address similar subject matter such as virtue-training, marriage, child-rearing, and slave supervision.⁵⁶ Likewise, the use of the epistolary form

ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν ἐλλήνων λογολεσχία τὸ θῆλυ μέρος αὐχρήσῃται, τοῦτο δὲ ἡ μία τούτων θεόσοφος, ἵνα τῆς χάριτος ὀφθῇ τὸ ὑπέρπλεον καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐνιζανούσης ἐλλάμψεως χάρισμα, my translation. Städele states that we have no letters from Macrina, and that “... bleibt das Kuriosum, daß zur Demonstration der Überlegenheit christlicher θεοσοφία über heidnische σοφία zunächst Schriften einer christlichen Heiligen und einer heidnischen Philosophin zusammengestellt wurden, von denen schließlich nur die der Heidin auf uns kamen” (*Die Briefe*, 334).

⁵³ Thesleff uses the label “Pseudopythagorica” for the large number of texts included in his two volumes, *Introduction* and *Pythagorean Texts*.

⁵⁴ The intellectual work of the original Pythagorean communities was believed to be in the areas of mathematics, astronomy, music theory (including *harmonia*), and on religious issues like immortality and reincarnation. A Pythagorean life involved communal living of women and men (including married couples), some kind of vegetarianism, cult practices which prescribed a vow of silence for initiates, special burial rites, and specific ethical commands. A recent, concise introduction is written by Charles H. Kahn, *Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans: A Brief History* (Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 2001). On Pythagorean eating habits, Kahn cites Aristotle’s description of the Pythagoreans: “[Aristotle] was able to collect a long list of *akousmata*, which includes the following items: Do not eat beans; do not pick up crumbs that fall from the table; do not eat white roosters; do not eat sacred fish. Do not break the bread, for bread brings friends together. Put salt on the table as a reminder of what is just” (ibid., 9).

⁵⁵ See above, Introduction, n. 42.

⁵⁶ Again, many of these are noted by Balch (“Neopythagorean Moralists,” 380–411). In addition to the letters and treatises of the Pythagorean women, he draws upon these texts and authors: Archytas, *On Law and Justice* and *On Moral Education*; Bryson, *On Household*

is not confined to these letters, since other Pseudo- or Neopythagorean letters carry famous names as well: *Pythagoras to Hieron*, *Lysis to Hipparchos*, and the many letters of Apollonius of Tyana. However, based on their female pseudonyms and feminine *topoi*, the five letters attributed to female Pythagoreans occupy a distinctive position within the broader category of Neopythagorean writings.

That these letters were composed under the Pythagorean names of “Melissa,” “Myia,” and “Theano” is due to the recollection that women were also trained in Pythagorean philosophy. Thus, the female authorial pseudonyms both drew upon and added to the authority of Pythagoreanism, even though they do not propagate that philosophy in its earliest form(s). Still, by selecting the names of these three women of the highest reputation as authors of these letters the “real” authors were able to capitalize on the later, almost universal reverence for Pythagoras and his philosophical movement. Since these letters offer entirely culturally acceptable instructions, if there were some lingering suspicion connected to the presence and roles of women in the earliest Pythagorean philosophical communities, the letters may even have served in an apologetic sense to establish securely the good reputations of all Pythagorean women.⁵⁷

Several elements eventually led to the collecting of the five women’s letters in the textual tradition. I have observed some clues about the processes of composing and collecting the letters. At the least, *Melissa to Kleareta* must have been composed separately from the letters of Theano,⁵⁸ but the letters of Theano also appear as a collection unto themselves. If *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate* are from the same hand, *Theano to Kallisto* could have been written to fill out that sub-collection TH₃ so that it would address the three-fold household roles for women of wife, mother,

Management; Callicratidas, *On the Happiness of Households*; Charondas, the Lawgiver; Damippus; Diotogenes, *On Sanctity*; Eccelus, *On Justice*; Hippodamus; Ocellus, *On the Nature of the Universe*; Pempelus, *On Parents*; and Zaleucus; also the biographical texts of Iamblichus and Porphyry, where household issues are treated. For further information, see again my Introduction, nn. 43, 45, 47, and 48.

⁵⁷ My suggestion extends Hawley’s analysis of literary treatments of early female philosophers: the very presence of women in philosophical circles needed to be “explained” by relating them to a male philosopher, and by portraying their virtues as feminine and distinct from the masculine (“The Problem of Women Philosophers,” 82). Taylor sees a similar apologetic purpose in Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa*: to explain the presence of women in the Therapeutic community by showing how conventionally virtuous they are (*Jewish Women Philosophers*, 222–224, 229–240).

⁵⁸ Even so, *Melissa to Kleareta* holds a place within the group of Doricized “Pseudopythagorica,” as categorized and analyzed by Thesleff in *Introduction*, 72–116.

and *despoina*.⁵⁹ Meanwhile, the Doricized *Myia to Phyllis* may have been composed with its linguistic sister-letter *Melissa to Kleareta* (as well as other Doric Pythagorean texts) in mind.⁶⁰ At the same time, the name “Theano,” wife of Pythagoras and mother of his daughter “Myia,” may have suggested the felicity of producing a letter under the name of the latter.

All three pseudonyms are associated with Pythagoreanism, but the collection of these letters cannot be based simply on the women’s presumed affiliation to a particular philosophical tradition: other extant letters ascribed to Pythagoreans (i.e., *Pythagoras to Hieron*, *Lysis to Hipparchos*, the letters of Apollonius of Tyana) do not exhibit the same sort of bonding. The latter do not always appear in a codex together. When they do, they are not transmitted in a consistent order and often are not even adjacent to each other. Furthermore, while the letters ascribed to male Pythagoreans are often transmitted in the same codices as these women’s letters, in no extant manuscript do all these letters (from men and women) follow sequentially, an examination of the manuscripts reveals no stable ordering that might suggest an overall “Pythagorean collection.” The regularity of the ordering of the Pythagorean women’s letters and their sub-collections is all the more conspicuous by comparison. The textual evidence leads to the conclusion that the five letters were gradually gathered together due to a combination of factors based, to be sure, on their Pythagorean credentials, but extending farther to a recognition of their “female” qualities. As an epistolary collection, the letters acquired and have maintained a special status among other moral-philosophical letters from antiquity: they are the only extant letters purporting to be correspondence *between women*. Similarly, their epistolary occasions are remarkable in their treatment of what were thought to be “women’s issues”: the feminine form of *sōphrosynē*, bodily adornment, and the triad of women’s household roles—wife, mother, and *despoina*.

⁵⁹ I have already suggested that the four-letter collection attributed to Theano in *Vat.Gr.578* builds upon the foundation of *TH3*, borrowing from and adding to the authority of the earlier collections.

⁶⁰ Since both “Melissa” and “Myia” are insect names, this could indicate another imaginative reason for placing their letters next to each other in a collection. See the testimonia regarding bees and flies in Chapter Two.

READING STRATEGIES FOR LETTER COLLECTIONS

The Pythagorean women's epistolary corpus comes from the literary world of Greco-Roman letter collections intended to convey moral-philosophical instruction.⁶¹ Its larger purpose is comparable to that of Seneca's collected letters to Lucilius, as described by Hildegard Cancik-Lindemaier:

The specifics of the philosophical topics found in Seneca ... cannot be grasped when isolated, as if they were "fragments." They actually are embedded in a *philosophical project*, that is, *moral progress in practice*, and realized in a particular literary form, that is, written epistles.⁶²

Cancik-Lindemaier states the value of the epistolary form as an effective educational resource⁶³ and also suggests the function of a *collection* of letters as a more comprehensive curricular text.⁶⁴ In response to this article, Margaret M. Mitchell advances the consideration of reading Seneca's letter collection by noting:

... *the literary form of the letter collection* is the medium by which one can "read into virtue" by both gazing there upon the image of the soul of Seneca in progress, and composing, through following his example and specific precepts, one's own self-portrait in the fleshly deeds and choices of one's life If one agrees with this thesis, *the issue of the relationship between the individual letter and the whole corpus* in the "narration of moral progress" becomes quite acute.⁶⁵

Mitchell asks: "Does the complete work display a careful architecture which corresponds to the moral curriculum toward virtue?"⁶⁶ Her question points

⁶¹ David E. Aune, "Letter collections," *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003).

⁶² "Seneca's Collection of Epistles: A Medium of Philosophical Communication," in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture*, 99; my italics.

⁶³ For example, she states: "... Seneca has projected a *pedagogic movement*, based upon Stoic morals and presupposing the whole system of Stoic philosophy; the needs of the *educational progress* produce the rhythm of the composition, such as, variation between more doctrinal parts in descriptive language and paraenetic parts in prescriptive language immediately aiming at practice. This process is, for philosophical reasons, conceived of as mutual, to be realized in the continuous communication of friends. The letter is the literary form which appropriately grants the intimacy required for representing a face-to-face communication" (ibid., 102; my italics).

⁶⁴ "The *corpus of epistles* is a narrative performance of moral progress The *corpus of epistles* enables the writer to construct the reciprocity of representation and self-representation: thus progress in dialogue is staged" (ibid., 102; my italics).

⁶⁵ "Reading to Virtue," 111; my italics.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 112. Mitchell then asks: "A further question is how this architectonic masterpiece might have been experienced (or not) in the history of reception of this work. Would anyone

to the possible importance of the ordering of collected letters: how the collection itself is structured in order to influence the anticipated student readers of the letters.

The fact that the Pythagorean women's letters survive materially as a corpus, rather than as individual letters means that it has been possible for both ancient and modern readers to read,⁶⁷ study, and discuss them as one entity. Consequently, a letter in a collection would not be read alone, but with reference to the others. Quintilian advocates such a strategy when reading texts, especially written speeches:

... our reading must be almost as thorough as if we were actually transcribing what we read. Nor must we study it merely in parts, but *we must read through the whole work from cover to cover and then read it afresh* For the orator frequently prepares his audience for what is to come, dissembles and sets a trap for them and makes remarks at the opening of his speech which will not have their full force till the conclusion.⁶⁸

This advice is based on the assumption that there is a logic to the organization of a speech, and that the reader can grasp that logic by means of thorough and repeated readings.

Similarly, the order of the letters within a collection must be examined to determine what might be the expected effect on the reader. As Patricia A. Rosenmeyer argues with respect to the fictional letter collections of Aelian, Alciphron, and others, "... the collecting of individual letters into

have read the whole work, *seriatim*, to gain this effect?" (ibid., n. 7). Another related question arises: "Must the reader complete a *lectio continua* of the whole circuit of one hundred twenty-four epistles, or could one receive the benefit of this correspondence course in virtue without experiencing the full extent of the corpus, in its present order?" (ibid., 113). Mitchell remarks on Cancik-Lindemaier's term "moral progress": "The initial question this raises is 'moral progress for whom?' For Seneca? For Lucilius? For the reader whom Seneca expects to take up this correspondence later, as he explains, for example, in *Ep.* 8: 'I am working for later generations, writing down some ideas that may be of assistance to them'?" (ibid., 110–111; trans. Richard M. Gummere, LCL).

⁶⁷ Here it is important to remember that "reading" in the Greco-Roman world was almost always an oral and communal activity rather than a silent and private one, so that a "reader" was also an "auditor." As Fantham explains: "No single word for the recipients of literature is without its limiting implications. An *audience* implies listening or watching without access to a text, so that the experience is single and linear, without possibility of review; a *readership* implies access only through a text; and a *public* implies distribution to a wide group outside the circle of the poet or writer. In early Latin literature, public and occasion go together, as they often will. The literature was for performance rather than for reading, and the question is largely of the context in which performance would take place" (*Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius* [Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996], 7–8; her italics).

⁶⁸ *Inst.* 10.1.20; LCL, trans. H.E. Butler; my italics.

an anthology seems to us to presume some sort of organizing principle, whether by chronology, by addressee, or by subject matter.”⁶⁹ Focusing on the last criterion, subject matter, Rosenmeyer offers two ideas about reading the letters in a collection. First, “... if we read sequentially, the meaning of each text is determined by that of the one that precedes it.”⁷⁰ Second, she suggests that the opening letter in a collection was placed there by the author or editor to be read as programmatic for the rest of the collection.⁷¹

Applying Rosenmeyer’s first claim to the Pythagorean women’s collection(s) means that the five letters successively build up a composite portrait of how a morally good woman ought to live. Reading the collection *seriatim* as found in Composite A shows the reader that it is not enough “only” to remain faithful to one’s husband (as in *Melissa to Kleareta*); a woman then needs to raise her children correctly (as in *Myia to Phyllis* and *Theano to Euboule*), and also to manage her household slaves well (*Theano to Kallisto*). Likewise, from a sequential reading, Myia’s advice on *infant* care leads “chronologically” to Theano’s letter dealing with *older children*. Approaching the letters in this way, a reader would encounter a curricular progression that moves from one stage of womanhood to another.

Rosenmeyer’s second proposal is helpful in considering the most common ordering which places *Melissa to Kleareta* first in Composite A, as well as in *P.Haun.* II.13.⁷² This letter might be thought of as “programmatic” in that the occasion of the letter appears to be “advice to a young bride” which is then followed by “advice on mothering” found in either the letter *Theano to Euboule* (in the case of *P.Haun.* II.13) or *Myia to Phyllida* (in the codices). Greco-Roman social convention would certainly dictate this sequence of events: a (free) woman ought to be married *before* she has children so that the children will be the legitimate children of her lawful husband; therefore a woman needs to know how to be a *sōphrōn* wife before she learns how to be a *sōphrōn* mother. The chronology of a woman’s life-stages is then carried forward by the order of the letters in Composite A, with the insertion of *Myia to Phyllida* (to a mother of a newborn) before *Theano to Euboule* (to a mother of somewhat older children). Still, any ordering

⁶⁹ *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 215.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 264.

⁷² On the other hand, the ordering principle for Composite B, where *Theano to Euboule* appears as the first letter of the five, could have something to do with Theano’s prominence as a Pythagorean.

principle for the last two letters in the sequence, *Theano to Nikostrate* and *Theano to Kallisto*, seems more opaque.⁷³

Then again, written texts offer the opportunity for second, third, and even further re-readings, again as noted by Quintilian:

Reading ... does not hurry past us with the speed of oral delivery; we can *re-read a passage again and again* if we are in doubt about it or wish to fix it in the memory. We must return to what we have read and reconsider it with care, while, just as we do not swallow our food till we have chewed it and reduced it almost to a state of liquefaction to assist the process of digestion, so what we read must not be committed to the memory for subsequent imitation while it is still in a crude state, but must be softened and, if I may use the phrase, reduced to a pulp by *frequent re-perusal*.⁷⁴

Furthermore, such “frequent re-perusals” advocated by Quintilian, would encourage moving forward or backward within a collection to check out a reference or a common motif in another letter or, in the case of the Pythagorean letters, to find advice that might be especially relevant to a particular female reader’s life circumstances. Such cross-referencing would be greatly assisted by the relative compactness of the Pythagorean women’s collection.⁷⁵

Rosenmeyer describes such a “re-perusing” reading strategy in her analysis of the order of the letters in Aelian’s collection *Letters of Farmers*: “The first two letters propel the reader forward; [while] the last letter functions as an explanation for the letters that precede it, tying the collection together as a whole.”⁷⁶ In that last letter, one of the farmers remarks that δικαιοσύνη (justice) and σωφροσύνη (moderation) are the most valuable crops to be harvested. Therefore, according to Rosenmeyer, “With that assessment by an internal character, we turn back to the collection to (re)read it sophistically, to hunt for ‘wisdom’ lurking in the lines.”⁷⁷

Considering the manuscript tradition of the Pythagorean women’s letters from this standpoint, we should turn to *Theano to Kallisto*, the last letter in Composite A as well as in TH3. Here “Theano” opens with a somewhat humorous assertion:

⁷³ If these were written by two different authors, then the order may simply reflect the original sequence of composition of the letters.

⁷⁴ *Inst.* 10.19; LCL; my italics.

⁷⁵ A total of about 225 lines, in Thesleff’s edition, or, for example, about nine and a half pages in the fifteenth-century codex *Ms. Chicago* 103.

⁷⁶ *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 312.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 314.

Indeed, to you younger women [νεωτέραις] authority has been given by custom to rule over the household slaves once you have been married, but the teaching [ἡ διδασκαλία] ought to come from the older women [πρεσβυτέρων] because they are forever giving advice [παραινούντων] about household management.⁷⁸ For it is good first to learn the things you do not know and to consider the counsel of the older women the most suitable; for a young soul must be brought up in these teachings from girlhood.⁷⁹

The assertion of an obligatory teaching-learning relationship between older and younger women leads a reader to the realization that all of the previous letters (i.e., in Composite A, or, at the least, in the sub-collection *TH3*) construct a similar instructional situation carried out by means of the letters. To go back and re-read all the letters from this perspective, we might justifiably conclude that each one contains teaching from a more mature married woman to a younger newlywed woman. This conclusion is supported by the statement of Melissa to Kleareta: “For your earnest wishing to hear about a wife’s decorous behavior gives a good hope that you are going to grow old [πολιοῦσθαι] in accordance with virtue.”⁸⁰ Indeed, since both the first letter in the Composite A collection (*Melissa to Kleareta*) and the last (*Theano to Kallisto*) depict the epistolary relationship as an older sender writing to a younger recipient, the two letters function as an *inclusio* for that collection as a whole.

The possession of any written text allows a reader the opportunity for “frequent re-perusal,” but the ancient predilection for writing and arranging letters as component parts of a collection⁸¹ adds a distinctive twist to subsequent re-readings. Although single letters may have different authors and recipients addressing diverse topics, when they are placed in a collection, each one’s “individuality” becomes part of a more complicated system

⁷⁸ This conjures up a wry image of an older woman continually giving advice despite the fact that it is not wanted by the younger woman.

⁷⁹ Ταῖς νεωτέραις ὑμῖν ἡ μὲν ἐξουσία παρὰ τοῦ νόμου δέδοται τῶν οἰκετῶν ἄρχειν ἅμα τῷ γῆ-μασθαι, ἡ δὲ διδασκαλία παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀπαντὰν ὀφείλει περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας αἰε παραινούντων. καλῶς γάρ ἔχει πρότερον μανθάνειν ἢ μὴ γιγνώσκετε, καὶ τὴν συμβουλὴν οἰκειοτάτην τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἡγεῖσθαι· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ παρθενοτροφεῖσθαι δεῖ νέαν ψυχὴν, lines 2–7.

⁸⁰ τὸ γὰρ ἐσπουδασμένως ἐθέλειν τὸ ἀκούσαι περὶ γυναικὸς εὐκοσμίας καλὰν ἐλπίδα διδοῖ ὅτι μέλλεις πολιοῦσθαι κατ’ ἀρετὴν, lines 2–5 in Städele’s edition. The unusual πολιοῦσθαι (lit.: “to grow gray”) has been changed to τελειοῦσθαι (“to reach maturity”) in *P.Haun.* II.13; either infinitive suggests that Kleareta is not at present an older woman.

⁸¹ For example, we possess the “real” letters of Cicero, Seneca, and Pliny the Younger, along with the later pseudonymous collections from Aelian, Lucian, and Philostratus. An introduction appears in Aune, “Letter collections,” *The Westminster Dictionary*. Rosenmeyer give a more extensive analysis (*Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 194–320).

of meaning. Some elements will seem to be thrown into relief by repetitions in other letters.⁸² Then, too, since the collection contains letters that focus on subject matter directed toward a woman's moral virtue, these somewhat separate topics (*sōphrosynē*, modest adornment, and household roles) become literally and conceptually linked to one another⁸³ so that the topic of one letter is read into the topics of the others.⁸⁴ This means that re-readings might also lead to a blending together (Quintilian's "reduce to a pulp"?) of the letters so that their distinctions might not be as noticeable. For instance, the tone of *Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis*, and *Theano to Kallisto* is friendly and encouraging, while the other two letters take a censorious approach; this difference might be softened when reading (and re-perusing) the collection as a whole.

On the other hand, as these letters became aggregated to each other they acquired a certain weightiness: *literally*, by adding to the number of pages of Pythagorean women's writings, but more importantly, *figuratively*, by accumulating an authoritative influence. This enhanced influence would operate in a mutual fashion, with individual letters adding their authority to and, at the same time, acquiring more authority from the other letters in the collection. Their authority surfaces first from the prestigious reputations of the pseudonyms of both authors and recipients so that, when the letters are positioned in a collection, the honor of each name extends to the others in the collection. In this way, the collection as a whole creates a picture of virtuous female Pythagoreans communicating with one another. Although we only hear one side of an epistolary dialogue in these texts, the letters'

⁸² On the other hand, some elements may appear more clichéd the more often they recur, as when two letters accuse *hetairai* of "hunting for men"; this nonetheless shows that the authors shared the same perception of such women. I examine the use of the *hetaira* as an immoral example in two of the letters.

⁸³ I perceive a similar linking of concepts in Waithe and Harper's analysis. They take up the term *harmonia* (found primarily in Periktione's *On the Harmony of a Woman*) which they then extrapolate to the other writings ascribed to Pythagorean women which make only rare use of cognates of *harmonia*. Thus, their *History of Women Philosophers* consistently refers to *harmonia* as a "normative principle" for these texts (6, 13, 15, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, 55, 56–57, 70); e.g., "... the Pythagorean women were concerned with the applications of the prevailing [*sic*] ethical theory to everyday life. They concerned themselves almost exclusively with analyzing the ways in which the normative principle of *harmonia* can be applied to the living of everyday life" (ibid., xx). *Myia to Phyllis* instructs that clothing for newborns should be "harmoniously fitted to the body," *προσπίπτουσα τῷ χρωτὶ εὐαρμόστως* (lines 29–30), but this is certainly not a strong evocation of a grander Pythagorean principle.

⁸⁴ Of course, the letters also make brief explicit mentions of other topics, as will be seen in the analysis of the subject matter of each letter.

form and contents imply companionable multi-generational relationships between senders and addressees, with each sender claiming some special knowledge of the addressee's individual circumstances.⁸⁵

THE ORIGINAL AUDIENCE FOR THE LETTER COLLECTION(S)

Drawing upon their textual history and our knowledge of "Roman literary culture,"⁸⁶ what can be said about the original audience for the Pythagorean women's letters? I have argued that the literal and metaphorical "weight" of an ancient letter collection enhanced its chances of preservation and thus its authors' chances of finding a wider audience in general. Two elements of the manuscript *P.Haun.* II.13 suggest that the Pythagorean women's letters were considered valuable. First, the letters are copied on the *verso* of another document in a recycling of the papyrus roll.⁸⁷ Second, *Melissa to Kleareta* has been translated into Koiné, which would make its contents more accessible to a general audience.⁸⁸ We have no way of determining who owned this papyrus, whether this person was male or female, or how the letters functioned in their life.

However, it is commonly recognized that, as Elaine Fantham puts it, "... it is likely that many Romans obtained as much benefit from listening to a public reading as from their own perusal of a text, or the more common situation in which they listened to their own readers."⁸⁹ Whether public or private, group performances of various literary genres were very common and popular, perhaps due to what Fantham calls "the lack of alternative entertainment."⁹⁰ In fact, Fantham points out that literary performance itself informed the composition of some texts:

⁸⁵ With these letters, the constructed epistolary occasions offer the opportunity to instruct women about the topics related to women's virtue: their roles and responsibilities and how proper fulfillment of them will make a woman good. Further elucidation appears in my analyses of the subject matter of each letter in Chapter Four.

⁸⁶ I borrow this phrase from the title of Fantham's suggestive analysis.

⁸⁷ It might be helpful to learn exactly what is on the *recto* of *P.Haun.* II.13 (see n. 29). For example, one could then speculate more about the ownership of the papyrus roll.

⁸⁸ Judge has already commented on this point, see n. 37.

⁸⁹ *Roman Literary Culture*, 214. "Their own readers" refers to those wealthy enough to acquire the services of such a reader. She says elsewhere: "In early Latin literature, public and occasion go together, as they often will. The literature was for performance rather than for reading, and the question is largely of the context in which performance would take place" (*ibid.*, 8).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 42; she speculates that this situation "increased both hunger for new compositions and tolerance for their lack of real intellectual novelty" (*ibid.*).

The table talk of Plutarch, of Athenaeus, and the discussions in public place and private parties recorded by Aulus Gellius may be fictionalized, but the kind of miscellaneous dialogue that they represented must have been immensely popular, or it would not have been developed and published and survived into our times.⁹¹

That there was an appreciative audience for hearing/reading texts in such a text-based society is surely a circular statement, yet it expresses the process by which, as with modern advertising, the literature “created” a larger audience for the product which audience then spurred the production of more literature.⁹² In particular, we have already seen the broad interest in letters, notably in pseudepigraphical ones, recapitulated by Rosenmeyer: “The pseudo-historical letters satisfied their authors’ urge to write biography, autobiography, and fiction all at once They must have been enjoyable to read, since so many letters survived from antiquity.”⁹³ And all letters, pseudepigraphical or not, would have been read aloud and listened to, rather than visually scanned in silence. When the Pythagorean women’s letters are viewed in this cultural context, it is clear that they similarly lend themselves to such “literary performances.” First, they are in the form of letters, which convey the pretense of a written dialogue which could be simply yet interestingly declaimed. Second, as a fairly short collection, they could be easily followed by listeners (and even re-read aloud, as discussed above).

We also know that Greco-Roman education was text-based and that especially at the levels of rhetorical and philosophical training students (who were almost all male) read and worked with a variety of written sources. They learned to analyze, imitate, and incorporate ancient authors in their own work.⁹⁴ Although none of the letters examined here appears

⁹¹ Fantham continues, “These works carried the illusion of literary performance into the studies of remote readers for whom such learned dialogues represented the ideal culture of the distant city” (ibid., 17).

⁹² Fantham briefly explains the process: “From the time of Horace onward we hear of readers in Africa or Spain who eagerly awaited the arrival of texts ‘published’ at Rome. The very distance from fashionable recitations may have accelerated the growth of a book trade, more necessary in Gaul or Spain than in Rome itself” (ibid., 10).

⁹³ *Ancient Greek Literary Letters*, 103.

⁹⁴ Criboire offers this succinct description of studying with a grammarian: “After following all the steps required for fluent reading, a student had to learn to dissect parts of the texts of the authors, distinguishing all their components. A passage, which was a thing closed in upon itself, was at the same time a dense cluster of interwoven linguistic and ‘historical’ elements When the grammarian pointed out to his class glosses, figures, tropes, relations of elements of language, similarities with other parts of an author’s work or the work of other authors in a proliferation of exegesis, a text became a perfect model to which other texts had to conform” (*Gymnastics of the Mind*, 187–188).

in any of the teachers' handbooks, one chreia ascribed to Theano surfaces repeatedly in classroom exercises.⁹⁵ At the least, then, many students would recognize her name and would have some sense of the style and content of "her" thinking; they would be prepared to handle texts by this author using the literary-critical skills they had developed. Another didactic origin for the letters might be suggested by the educational exercises like προσωποποιία or ἡθοιοποιία: a student could adopt the mind and character of a revered female philosopher and write a letter in her voice.⁹⁶

But what might be the demographics of an audience for these letters? All five letters are thoroughly "female," that is, they name women as senders and addressees and their settings are those in which women live and move. Furthermore, their topics are those typically of "feminine" concern: women's roles in marriage, childrearing, and household management. Does such textual accumulation of "women's interests" signify that the intended audience members for the letters were women? The answer must be both "yes" and "no," and even then remain somewhat a matter of conjecture.

That the authors wanted "ultimately" to reach an audience of women must almost certainly be true, for the whole epistolary purpose is to advise women on their behavior in certain prescribed female arenas. Women, as an undifferentiated group, were perceived by these authors as needing sex-specific advice about proper feminine behavior.⁹⁷ But how would the information contained in the letters reach the ears (and/or eyes) of this intended audience? While there is no evidence at all for how women might have used such instructional letters,⁹⁸ I suggest a few plausible women-only settings in which such texts might have been encountered. The letters might

⁹⁵ I discuss this chreia more at length in Chapter Two. The documentation can be found in *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric. Vol. 2: Classroom Exercises* (trans. and eds. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil; Writings from the Greco-Roman World; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 205–206, 218–223.

⁹⁶ I believe that the textual history generally proves otherwise: the letters were collated into collection(s) very early on, so that some of the letters appear to have been composed in order to add to the original one(s). See Chapter Two on the authorial voices of the letters.

⁹⁷ Similarly, the treatises by the female Pythagoreans Phintys and Periktione have no stated audience, yet they too focus on women's behavior in marriage, child-rearing, and household management.

⁹⁸ I cannot find much scholarly discussion on the question of the gender of the letters' audience. Being more interested in the evidence for ancient women philosophers, Waithe and Harper focus on the work of these authors, rather than on the hearers: "... it was necessary for women to conceive of the enterprise of moral philosophy in new ways which took into account the limitations that ancient societies had placed on [women]" (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 57). Judge does wonder if the transformation of *P.Haun.* II.13 into a Koiné document was "... an advantage for women in particular?" ("A Woman's Behavior," 23).

have been read to or by girls or younger women as part of an educational program in the home.⁹⁹ The letters could have been read to groups of women (slave, freed, and/or freeborn) while they were weaving or doing some other fairly stationary household task such as shelling beans, or listened to as some after-dinner entertainment for women's ears only. A mother might have reminded her daughter: "Remember what Theano said to Kallisto about how to treat slaves." Or an aunt may have cautioned a niece: "As Theano said, a moderate wife controls her jealousy of her husband's *hetaira*." It is not out of line to imagine an all-female "wedding shower" for a young bride at which Melissa's letter was read as "educational entertainment."¹⁰⁰

On the other hand, the letters are not irrelevant to the activities of men, who were, after all, also living and working in households.¹⁰¹ One can imagine men (husbands, fathers, and sons) composing and/or hearing this "instruction" in educational settings so that they themselves would know how to manage their households (and their wives, daughters, mothers, and female slaves). Did the men then recount what they learned at school when they returned to their families, perhaps discussing it with their women-folk, maybe during or after a meal, as a sort of *symposium*? Or might it be that men in wealthy families copied the letters to add them to their private library as signs of their status, as well as reminders for their own wives and daughters? In one case, this kind of advice literature was indeed passed on to a son: the two treatises on women's proper behavior by the Pythagoreans Phintys and Periktione (along with other writings on women's virtue and their household roles) were preserved in the *Anthologium* of Stobaeus, which is addressed to his son Septimius.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Was there such a setting as a "girls' school"? There is no evidence for such schools from Cribiore's investigations (*Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996]; and *Gymnastics of the Mind*, chapter 3, "Women and Education," 74–101).

¹⁰⁰ As will be noted below, this letter contains a sexual innuendo, which might also be appropriate for the ribaldry of a bridal shower setting. We also have the example of Plutarch's *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, a text that may have been read at a wedding, and which includes instructions for both spouses (although more for the bride than for the groom).

¹⁰¹ Cribiore's study of private letters shows that "Even though a comprehensive study of men's letters is still a desideratum, and many more men were involved in correspondence, it does not appear that the concerns of propertied men were much different from those of women of the same class, or conversely that men were less sensitive to family matters" (*Gymnastics of the Mind*, 90).

¹⁰² This educational purpose comes from the introduction written by the ninth-century patriarch Photius: "Four books were published by Johannes Stobaeus of excerpts, apophthegms, instructions in two volumes. He addresses these things to his own son Septimius, collecting (them), as he also says, as a labor of love. His anthology was from {the philosophers

By the use and transmission of various textual resources, the cultural expectations of virtuous masculinity and femininity could be passed on to everyone, so that each person knew his or her roles and responsibilities and could function appropriately within their social spheres. Still, this small Pythagorean corpus takes on the distinct educational purpose of providing instruction in moral philosophy for *women*. In doing so, the letters focus exclusively on issues related to the three primary and approved roles for women: wife, mother, and house-mistress. That the letters are preserved as a philosophical epistolary collection reflects the supposition that women who seek to “do philosophy” will best enact that life within the domestic arena, and thus reach the superlative feminine position of philosophers of the household. The remaining chapters of Part One demonstrate the ways in which this letter collection focuses on the other essential elements (the roles of teachers and learners, the pedagogical methods, and the topics covered) of the overall curriculum for educating women toward such virtuous living.

and} the poets and rhetoricians, and from those who have lived industriously from one realm to another, from whom, as he also says, he gathered the selections, the apophthegms and some counsels, for the *correcting and bettering of his son ...*,” Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰωάννου Στοβαίου, ἐκλογών, ἀποφθεγμάτων, ὑποθηκῶν, βιβλία τέσσαρα ἐν τεύχεσι δυοί. Προσφωνεῖ δὲ ταῦτα, δι’ ὃν καὶ τὴν συνάθροισιν φιλοπονήσαι λέγει, Σεπτیمیῳ ἰδίῳ υἱῷ. Ἡ δὲ συναγωγὴ αὐτῶ ἔκ {φιλοσόφων καὶ} τε ποιητῶν καὶ ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς πολιτείας λαμπρῶς βεβιωκότων ἐγένετο, ὧν ὥς καὶ αὐτός φησι τῶν μὲν τὰς ἐκλογὰς τῶν δὲ τὰ ἀποφθέγματα καὶ τινων ὑποθήκας συλλεξάμενος, ἐπὶ τῷ ῥυθμίσει καὶ βελτιώσει τῷ παιδι ..., *Biblio*.167. My italics indicate the use Stobaeus intended for his anthology: the education of his son. It would strengthen my argument of viewing the Pythagorean women’s letters as “textual resources” if they were prefaced in a fashion similar to this introduction of Stobaeus’ *Anthologium*.

ANNOTATED TRANSLATIONS

My translations of these five letters attributed to Pythagorean women are placed in the order of Composite A because it is the most common extant arrangement, and also because it replicates to some small extent the order found in *P.Haun.* II.13. These new English translations are based upon the critical edition by Alfons Städele, *Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer* (found in Appendix A) which arranges the letters in this sequence. For *Melissa to Kleareta*, I have also drawn upon the edition of *Papyrus Hauniensis* II.13 by Adam Bülow-Jacobsen. My notes provide comments and a defense of my own translation choices.

Other modern English translations of the letters are lacking in several ways. First, with one exception, they do not translate all of the letters in the collection(s). Four of the five letters are found in Mary Ellen Waithe, ed., *A History of Women Philosophers* (1987), but the letter *Melissa to Kleareta* is inexplicably missing.¹⁰³ All the letters are indeed found in I.M. Plant, ed., *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome* (2004) but, following Waithe and Harper, Plant attempts to position all the Pythagorean women's texts according to the time each woman supposedly lived (so that Theano's letters come before that of Myia, her daughter).¹⁰⁴ Second, most translations are

¹⁰³ For translations of the texts, Waithe relied on philosopher Vicki Lynn Harper, who used Thesleff's volume alongside Hercher's edition of the letters. Harper tends to translate more freely than I do; while this makes for easier reading at times, linguistic niceties in vocabulary and syntax are lost. I have documented some of my disagreements with Harper in the footnotes of the translations later in this chapter.

¹⁰⁴ Plant's translations are somewhat more colloquial than my own, and have few annotations. In all of the available translations of the Pythagorean texts, two items crucial for my argument are translated inconsistently. For ἑταῖραι Plant uses "courtesans" (*MK*, line 10; *Women Writers*, 83) and "prostitutes" (*ThN*, line 30; *ibid.*, 73). For σωφρο- terms, he chooses sometimes "sensible" (*MK*, line 5 and *MPh*, line 17; *ibid.*, 83, 79–80), but also "moderation" (*MK*, lines 16–17, 18–19, and *ThE*, line 4; *ibid.*, 83, 70), and "chastity" (*On the Sôphrosynê*, *Stob.*, *Anth.* 4.23.61 [W.-H. 589, 590, 591, 593]; *Women Writers*, 85–86). Malherbe's translation of *MK* (from Städele) uses "heterae" for *hetairai*, and "temperate/temperance" and "virtue" for *sôphrôn* and *sôphrosynê* in *MK* and *ThE* (*Moral Exhortation* [1986], 83–84). In *History of Women Philosophers* (1987, 26–28, 30–31), Waithe and Harper use "moderation/moderate" for the first section of *On the Sôphrosynê* (*Stob.*, *Anth.* 4.23.61), but then switch to "temperate" in 4.23.61a. In their translation of *MPh*, the word "temperate" appears again, and "temperance" in *ThE*. The word *hetaira* becomes "courtesan" throughout *ThN*. Judge offers a translation of *MK* from *P.Haun.* II.13, where "moderate/moderation" are used consistently, but Judge introduces "call-girls" for *hetairai* ("A Woman's Behaviour" [*NewDocs* 6 (1992)], 20). In Winter's translation of *MK* (based on Judge's transcription of *P.Haun.* II.13, and modifying that translation; *Roman Wives* [2003], 72), the word *hetairai* is first transliterated, but then is followed by "call-girls" in parentheses. See also n. 199 below. Winter chooses "modest" for *sôphrôn* (lines 5, 16–17, 18–19) in

not based on Städele's edition, but on Thesleff's more widely-used edition, which has adopted some of Hercher's dubious emendations. Third, because Thesleff has positioned the letters with no regard for their text historical sequence, as described above, English translations which follow his edition (including those of Waithe/Harper and Plant), tend to replicate the problematic arrangement.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, as scholars pick and choose from among the letters, or use only portions of the letters, or even intersperse them with the treatises ascribed to the Pythagorean women Phintys and Periktione (with their different textual history), the links between the five individual letters are obscured, undermining any understanding that the letters even form a collage of collections and thwarting any plan to read the collected letters within their sets. My claim is that the letters need to be read through in order, and then re-read, and cross-referenced *within the collection(s)* in order to come to terms with their combined rhetorical-instructional purpose: the moral-philosophical education of women.

Collection MM: Letters of Melissa and Myia

As mentioned above, *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, like many other Pseudopythagorean texts are characterized throughout by certain Doricisms and other archaisms, which are discussed by Thesleff.¹⁰⁶ Doric characteristics specific to the small collection *MM* include:

- (1) α for η (καλάν for καλήν, τάν for τήν, etc.)
- (2) Uncontracted εε, εα, εο, εω
- (3) Masculine genitive singular ending (-ω for -ου)
- (4) Thematic infinitive ending -εν, as in ἔχεν for ἔχειν, ἐθέλεν for ἐθέλειν
- (5) Athematic infinitive ending -μεν (as in ἤμεν for εἶναι; δόμεν for διδόναι)
- (5) Doric forms of pronouns (2nd singular: τύ, τοί, for σύ, σοί)
- (6) ὦν for οὔν
- (7) ποτί for πρὸς (e.g., ποτῆμεν for προσεῖναι)
- (8) ποττάν for πρὸς τάν
- (9) The poetic πέλει for ἐστί
- (10) Feminine participle endings -ευσα rather than -ουσα (ποιεῦσαν = ποιοῦσαν)
- (11) The ending -εντι for -εστι (πάρεντι = πάρεστι)
- (12) The poetic νοῦσος for νόσος
- (13) μικρός for μικρός

describing a virtuous wife, but “moderate” for the husband (this word appears only in *P.Haun.* II.13, line 30).

¹⁰⁵ Waithe and her co-writer and translator Harper have detached the letters from their text-historical order and interspersed them with texts, stories, and *gnomai* from other Pythagorean women.

¹⁰⁶ *Introduction*, 85–91.

Melissa to Kleareta

Melissa to Kleareta. Greetings.¹⁰⁷

It appears to me¹⁰⁸ that on your own¹⁰⁹ you have most good attributes. For your earnest wish to hear about a wife's decorous behavior offers a good hope that you are going to grow old¹¹⁰ in accordance with virtue. So then, the *sôphrôn*¹¹¹ and married woman¹¹² must belong to¹¹³ her lawful husband, adorned with silence¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ *P.Haun.* II. 13 has a space after *χαίρειν*, *Papyri*, 8. Regarding the greeting *χαίρειν*, Bülow-Jacobsen concludes: "Städele consistently puts *χαίρειν* in brackets against all the MSS, because it is not normally found in letters that have been collected in corpora. The emendation is hardly justified" (*Papyri*, 9). In the one example I have been able to examine, *Ms. Chicago* 103, the epistolary prescript is set apart in red ink, with a *χαίρειν* following the names of sender and recipient in four of the five letters: *Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis*, *Theano to Euboule*, and *Theano to Nikostrate*. However, in support of Städele's point, the greeting is missing from *Theano to Kallisto*, which has the additional nicety of closing the entire letter collection with "ἔρρωσο" (which is written in black ink). Thus, in partial agreement with Bülow-Jacobsen, I have omitted the brackets around the *χαίρειν* at the start of the first four letters, and have included the ἔρρωσο at the end of *Theano to Kallisto*.

¹⁰⁸ Städele chooses the reading of manuscripts O and 517, which have ἐμὶν. This appears to have been changed in the τ manuscript family to ἐμῖν, and then in 4454 to ἡμῖν. *P.Haun.* II.13 offers the Koiné μοι, suggesting that it replaces the Doric singular ἐμὶν.

¹⁰⁹ The adverb αὐτόματως means "of itself," and the adjective has several connotations: "acting of one's own will" (of persons); "spontaneous" (of inanimate things); and "happening of themselves, without external agency" (of events), LSJ, s.v. αὐτόματος. With respect to "Melissa's" statement to Kleareta, it seems ambiguous to me whether Kleareta has played an active or passive role in acquiring the "good attributes."

¹¹⁰ Lit: "turn gray."

¹¹¹ *Sôphrôn* and the trait of *sôphrosynê* are key terms for this letter.

¹¹² ἐλευθέραν may mean "free [woman]" or "married woman," LSJ, s.v. ἐλεύθερος.

¹¹³ ποτῆμεν is Doric for προσεῖναι (εἰμί *sum*); for this instance LSJ, s.v. ποτῆμεν. *P.Haun.* II.13 has substituted the Koiné προσεῖναι. Städele translates "zusammenleben"; Malherbe and Winter have "to live with" (Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 83; Winter, *Roman Wives*, 72).

¹¹⁴ In spite of the manuscript evidence, Städele emended ἀσυχία (= ἡσυχία), opting for αἰσχύνᾳ. He admits that "Die Hss. überliefern ἀσυχία," but he rejects that word as incompatible with the author's use of concepts like ἀρετή (4f.), αἰδῶς (15), καλοκαγαθία, κοσμιότης, σωφροσύνη (16f.), saying that "ἡσυχία passt nicht zu ihnen, wohl aber αἰσχύνῃ, das wir in genau dem gleichen Zusammenhange in einem Fragment der Phintys ... finden ..." (*Die Briefe*, 258). But Städele's argument that ἡσυχία is not a proper word for women's adornment may be contested by a comparison to the 1 Timothy 2:9–12, where ἡσυχία is closely connected to proper feminine adornment. Annette Merz discusses women's silence as their adornment (*Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* [NTOA/SUNT 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004], 279–288). Also, Bülow-Jacobsen states: "αἰσχύνᾳ is Städele's conjecture which is not supported by the papyrus [which is missing only four letters after the ἡσ–]. As the word is disputed I have not supplemented, but in all probability the papyrus had ἡσυχία like the ἀσυχία of all the later MSS" (*Papyri*, 9). I have taken Bülow-Jacobsen's emendation for my translation.

[but not very craftily],¹¹⁵ and dressed in clothing that is whitened, clean and simple, but not very expensive or excessive. For she ought to avoid garments of purple cloth,¹¹⁶ and those that are shot through with purple and gold, since this sort is useful to the *hetairai*¹¹⁷ in their hunting¹¹⁸ of many men. But the adornment proper to the woman who is well pleasing to her very own [husband] is¹¹⁹ her way of life, and not her robes.¹²⁰ For the married woman must appear¹²¹ fair of form to her own husband, but not to the neighbors.¹²² You

¹¹⁵ The words ἀλλὰ μὴ πολυτερεῶς were first challenged by Städele: “Dies scheint, da man dem Autor des Briefe seine solch plumpe Wiederholung innerhalb weniger Zeilen nun doch nicht zutrauen möchte, eine aus dem folgenden ἀλλὰ μὴ πολυτελεῖ (καὶ περισσάν, Z. 8) abgeleitete und später verschriebene Glosse zu sein” (*Die Briefe*, 258). He criticizes Thesleff’s inclusion of this phrase in his edition (*ibid.*). This phrase is also addressed by Bülow-Jacobsen in regard to *P.Haun.* II.13: “For reasons of space it would seem that the papyrus did not have the impossible πολυτερεῶς of all the later MSS which Städele has been the first editor to put in brackets instead of correcting it” (*Papyri*, 9). In Bülow-Jacobsen’s reading, line 10 of the papyrus reads: ἀν[δ]ρί προσεῖναι ἢσ[... κεκαλλωπισμέ-], indicating that the papyrus lacks not just the πολυτερεῶς but also ἀλλὰ μὴ (*ibid.*).

¹¹⁶ The manuscripts transmit ὁλομυγῇ (“wholly-mixed”), and one has a handwritten marginal correction ὁμομυγῇ, both of which Städele calls “unsinnige Ersatzformen,” and substitutes ἀλοσυργῇ for “purple clothing,” which is better attested and more common. *P.Haun.* II.13 has ± 8 spaces here, and thus cannot help.

¹¹⁷ Lit., “female companions.” I transliterate this word throughout, see my further analysis below of *hetairai* as immoral examples, found here and in *Theano to Nikostrate*.

¹¹⁸ The word θήρα is related to θήρ, or “beast of prey, esp. a lion,” LSJ, s.v. θήρ. It literally means “hunting of wild animals,” but is used metaphorically to mean “eager pursuit of anything,” LSJ, s.v. θήρα. A similar connection of *hetairai* with “hunting men” is made in *Theano to Nikostrate*.

¹¹⁹ Städele notes that “Das poetische Wort πέλει wird auch sonst in später dorischer und ionischer Prosa verwendet ...” (*Die Briefe*, 262). *P.Haun.* II.13 uses the Koine εἶστιν.

¹²⁰ *P.Haun.* II.13 has the singular ἡ στολή rather than the plural αἱ στολαί, probably since, as Städele states, “Der Plural des bei den Tragikern häufig belegten Wortes ist ungewöhnlich” (*ibid.*).

¹²¹ The aorist middle infinitive ἰδέσθαι would usually be translated with an active meaning, but that seems unlikely here. Städele translates this with a passive infinitive: “Denn schön anzusehen muß die freie Frau für ihren eigenen Mann sein ...” (*ibid.*, 161).

¹²² On τοῖς πλασίον Städele remarks: “Diese pseudodorische, eigentlich äolische Form ... ist eindeutige Überlieferung aller Hss.” (*ibid.*, 263). *P.Haun.* II.13 has changed this to a singular τῷ πλησίον.

At this point, Städele’s edition places a paragraph break (adopted from Hercher’s edition). Städele ends the first paragraph with ἀλλ’ οὐ τοῖς πλασίον, and begins the second paragraph with Ἐχοῖς ἄν ἐπὶ. Contrariwise, *P.Haun.* II.13, line 22 continues without a break, reading: ἀλλ’ οὐ τῷ πλησίον, ἔχουσιν μὲν [ἐ-] (continued on line 23 with πῖ). On the basis of this reading, Bülow-Jacobsen criticizes the paragraphing adopted by Städele (from Hercher), “[Städele] introduces a major stop before ἐχοῖς ἄν thus breaking the sentence where the sense continues unbroken. The papyrus certainly has the better text. It has preserved the χρή which governs the accusative with the infinitive from εὐμορφον to ἰδέσθαι and this construction is continued with the participle ἔχουσιν. In the Doric text ἔχουσιν must have been represented by the Aeolic and ps.-Doric ἔχοισαν. When χρή was accidentally left out at some later stage of the transmission the participle became awkward [sic] and was corrected to ἐχοῖς ἄν, evidently in an

should¹²³ have a blush as a sign of modesty on your face instead of rouge, and goodness and the height of decorum and *sōphrosynē* instead of gold and emeralds; for the woman who strives for¹²⁴ *sōphrosynē* should not be enthusiastic for the extravagance of clothing,¹²⁵ but for the management of her household. And she should please¹²⁶ her own husband by completing his desires, since the wishes of her husband ought to be an unwritten law for the decorous woman, according to which she must live. And she must consider that, along with herself, her orderly behavior has been offered as her best and greatest dowry(-gift). She must trust in the beauty and wealth of her soul rather than that of her looks and possessions;¹²⁷ for jealousy and sickness take away from the latter, but the former are present in good order¹²⁸ even to the point of death.¹²⁹

accentuated manuscript" (*Papyri*, 9). I have adopted Bülow-Jacobsen's supposition because it also makes sense in light of the contents of the clauses: it helps to link the somewhat risqué teasing about neighbor-men looking at the wife's beautiful body with the advice that follows about the natural blush she ought to have on her face.

¹²³ A potential optative may act as an imperative (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1820). Cf. also Städele, "Der Optativ mit *ἄν* dient hier 'als mildere Form der Bitte und Aufforderung' (KG 1, 233 f.);" (*Die Briefe*, 263).

¹²⁴ *PHaun*. II.13 changes this phrase by dropping the participle τὰν γλιχομένων and apparently substituting σώφρονα (σώφρ[ον]α) for the noun σωφροσύνα.

¹²⁵ *PHaun*. II.13 here reads "the extravagance of clothing *and of body*," τὴν [τ]ῆς ἐσθῆτος καὶ τοῦ σ[ώ]ματος πολυτέλει[αν]. Further comments on spacing are given by Bülow-Jacobsen (*Papyri*, 9).

¹²⁶ Where the later manuscripts have here "δὲ αὐτάν" (as the subject of the infinitive), *PHaun*. II.13 substitutes the adjectival participle "τε σωφρονούντι," so that the phrase would read "she should please her *sōphrōn* husband." Bülow-Jacobsen says this "must be understood 'in so far as he is reasonable' which does not ring quite true in this context" (*Papyri*, 10). Does the papyrus version advise that a wife does not need to please an immoderate husband?

¹²⁷ Here the manuscript edition has τὰς ὀψιός καὶ τῶν χρημάτων. *PHaun*. II.13 has substituted Koiné forms and reversed the phrase: "possessions and looks" (τῶν χρημάτων καὶ τῆς ὀψεως), line 38.

¹²⁸ The word is uncertain. The early *α* manuscript family has ἐντεταγμένα, while Hercher reads ἐντεταμένα. Städele adopts ἐκτεταμένα, from ἐκτείνω because: "Diese von den meisten Hss. überlieferte Form entspricht durchaus dem geforderten Sinn 'sich erstrecken, hinreichen bis'" (*Die Briefe*, 266). In *PHaun*. II.13, the whole sentence is expanded: τὰ μὲν γὰρ χρήμα{σ}τα καὶ τὰ σώματα χρόνος, φθόνος, νοῦσος, τύχη παραιρεῖται· ἡ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς εὐκοσμία μέχρι θανάτου πάρεστι ταῖς κεκτημέναις ("For time, jealousy, sickness, fortune take away from possessions and bodies, but the decorum of her soul accompanies the things that have been acquired until death"). Thus, Bülow-Jacobsen disagrees with Städele: "Even though ταῖς κεκτημέναις is a *lectio facillior* compared to the later manuscripts and editions, I feel certain that it reflects an original τὰ κεκταμένα which should be accepted by future editors" (*Papyri*, 10). Even so, it seems to me that the form ἐντεταγμένα is good choice because it conveys a sense of orderliness that the author has been advising. It is used to describe the wet-nurse as an "orderly woman" (τεταγμένα) in *Myia to Phyllis*, line 17.

¹²⁹ In *PHaun*. II.13, there is a blank space at the end of line 42, showing the end of the letter.

Myia to Phyllis

Myia to Phyllis. Greetings.¹³⁰

Now that you have become a mother of children, I advise you as follows: choose for yourself a wet-nurse who is most well-disposed and clean, and, what is more, modest and not inclined to sleep nor indeed to strong drink. For this is the kind of woman who might be judged best¹³¹ for raising¹³² free children¹³³—if, that is, she has nutritious milk and is not an easy conquest¹³⁴ for bedding down with a man.¹³⁵ A great help¹³⁶ in this is that for her whole life she is first and primarily directed to their upbringing¹³⁷ by nursing them well. For she will do everything well at the appropriate time.¹³⁸ She will offer the breast and suckling¹³⁹ and nourishment not whenever it crosses her mind, but with some forethought, for that is how she will lead the infant to health. Let her not succumb whenever she herself wishes to sleep, but whenever the newborn has a desire of rest; for she will offer no little¹⁴⁰ relief to the child. But let a nurse never be inclined to anger nor talkative nor indifferent in

¹³⁰ On the position of χαίρειν, see n. 107.

¹³¹ At this point, Harper translates ἂ τοιάδε γὰρ ἂν κρίνοιτο κρατίστα (lines 4–5) as “such a woman will be best able to judge” (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 15). I take the Present Middle/Passive κρίνοιτο to refer to the “judging” done by the new mother in her selection of the wet-nurse.

¹³² I take the phrase ποττὸ ἐκτρέφειν as a contraction of the Doric ποτί (for πρὸς) plus τό, combined with the Doric form of the infinitive ἐκτρέφειν, to make an articular infinitive. Says Städele on ποτί: “Die Formen, die mit πρὸς bzw. ποτί gebildet sind ..., zeigen die sprachliche Inkonsistenz des Briefes ...” (*Die Briefe*, 270).

¹³³ The Doric form ἐλευθέρως appears to be the accusative, masculine, plural adjective, not the later adverb. Städele likewise translates this “freigeborene Kinder” (*ibid.*, 163).

¹³⁴ εὐνίκατος is Doric for εὐνίκατος; this use cited in LSJ, s.v. εὐνίκατος. See also line 13, which cautions that she should not be “overcome” (νικήται) by sleep. In *Theano to Nikostrate* the recipient's name indicates that she is also a conqueror.

¹³⁵ Harper's translation is freer than mine for the phrase “ταῖς πρὸς ἄνδρα κοίταις” (lines 6–7). She offers: “... by her husband's entreaties to share his bed” (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 16).

¹³⁶ Städele interprets μερίς as “Hilfe, Beistand,” a usage “zuerst belegt bei Demosth.or. 21, 184 ...” (*Die Briefe*, 271–272).

¹³⁷ I have taken the unusual form τραφήμεν (rearing) as a Doric infinitive of τράφω (= τρέφω), although, according to Thesleff, this -ημεν infinitive ending is for athematic verbs. (See *Melissa to Kleareta*, line 6, where ποτήμεν is the Doric for προσεῖναι). However, for this word, a somewhat similar Doric infinitive form, τραφέμεν, appears in Hesiod *Th.* 480, LSJ, s.v. τράφω. In line 9 ποττὸ καλῶς τραφήμεν reiterates and expands ποττὸ ἐκτρέφειν from line 5.

¹³⁸ Hercher and Städele make the first paragraph break here, but I have combined the first and second paragraphs because they address the role and prerequisites of the wet-nurse.

¹³⁹ My translation, like that of Plant, makes sense of τὸν τιτθὸν τε καὶ μαζόν, both of which can mean “breast.” However, Städele identifies this as a hendiadys: “καὶ μαζὸν braucht nicht mit Schaefer als Glosse getilgt zu werden, da dem Verfasser des Briefes ein solch ‘anspruchsvolles’ Hendiadyon durchaus zuzutrauen ist” (*Die Briefe*, 273).

¹⁴⁰ μικρόν being Doric for μικρόν; cf. *ibid.*, 274.

the selection of food, but be orderly and *sōphrōn*; if it is possible,¹⁴¹ let her not be a barbarian, but a Greek.¹⁴²

It is best for the newborn to be directed to sleep in this way, even if he is nicely full of milk, for such sustenance should be sweet and easily digestible for the young ones; but if there is any other [sustenance],¹⁴³ she must give the most simple. But she¹⁴⁴ must completely¹⁴⁵ abstain from wine because it is so strong, or just give¹⁴⁶ a scant quantity mixed into the evening milk. Do not make baths frequent, for occasional and temperate¹⁴⁷ baths are a better practice.¹⁴⁸ For the same reasons, suitable¹⁴⁹ air also ought to have an equal proportion¹⁵⁰ of heat and cold, and for the house not

¹⁴¹ Städele notes the “rather unusual” form of this phrase, with an impersonal subject and that in the plural (ibid., 274).

¹⁴² Here Hercher and Städele begin the third paragraph, which break I have kept because the next section begins with the stressed statement “It is best” (ἄριστον), and because it focuses more on the care of the infant.

¹⁴³ αἱ δὲ κα χᾱτέραν begins with the Doric αἱ κα which Städele compares to ἑάν: “Die dorischen Formen αἱ κα ... wirken nach dem unmittelbar vorhergehenden ἑάν (Z.19) (und ἄν [Z.21]) besonders auffällig” (ibid., 276).

¹⁴⁴ It seems clear from the end of the sentence that it is the infant who must be kept away from wine, as in Städele’s translation: “Des Weines muß sich das Kind gänzlich enthalten” (ibid., 165). However, the middle/passive infinitive ἀπέχεσθαι with the genitive can mean “hold oneself off a thing, abstain or desist from it,” LSJ, s.v. ἀπέχω. Then the directive would be aimed at the wet-nurse, as I have indicated here. She is the one who has the physical capacity and work responsibility for nourishing the child. It would also make some sense that drinking alcohol is prohibited for the wet-nurse herself, since the alcohol would be transmitted to the child through her milk.

¹⁴⁵ παράπαν is another compound word, this time of παρά and πᾶν, meaning “altogether,” or “absolutely.”

¹⁴⁶ Taking the καττό with the articular infinitive μεταδιδόμεν. This refers to mixing wine with the evening milk (τᾷ κράσει δέειλον γαλακτώδες), indicating that some milk is given to infants by some means other than the breast.

¹⁴⁷ Here the word εὐκράτων for water of mixed-temperature plays off the evening drink mixture (κράσει) of wine and milk. The idea of a “measured amount” of things continues with the instructions to maintain a proportion of household air temperature and of the taste of water. (Perhaps the author means here what we would call “hard” and “soft” water, following Städele’s translation: “sehr hartes noch sehr weiches Wasser” [Die Briefe, 165].) The mixing of opposites appears to end with the instruction regarding bedding, which says only that it should not be too rough, making no explicit comment on avoiding soft bedding. However, the summary statement that follows may be understood to encompass luxurious bedding as well: “for in all these things, nature yearns for what suits it, but not what is extravagant,” ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τούτοις τὸ οἰκείον ἂ φύσις ἐπιποθεῖ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τὸ πολυτελέες, lines 30–31.

¹⁴⁸ Hercher and Städele begin the fourth paragraph here. I have ignored the break because of the word κατταυτά, a crasis of κατὰ and ταῦτα (or maybe, of κατα, τὰ, and αὐτά), which links the mixed milk and temperate baths with proportion in air, water, and bedding. The word means “in relation to, concerning,” “in the same way,” or “corresponding with, after the fashion of,” LSJ, s.v. κατὰ, B.IV.2 and 3.

¹⁴⁹ The word ἐπιτάδειος is Doric for ἐπιτήδειος, meaning “suitable, convenient, useful, necessary,” LSJ, s.v. ἐπιτήδειος.

¹⁵⁰ A similar appeal for “equal proportion” (συμμετρ(ίαν)) will be urged again in *Theano to Kallisto* where the *despoina* is advised: “proportion is best in all things,” μέτρον δ’ ἐπὶ πάντων ἄριστον, lines 44–45.

to be too drafty nor too stifling.¹⁵¹ Nor is it suitable for water to be either harsh¹⁵² or alluring to the taste, nor for the bedding to be rough, but it ought to wrap closely, accommodating the body. For in all these things, nature desires what suits it, but not what is extravagant.¹⁵³ So then, for now it is not useless to write down these things for you, inasmuch as good expectation comes from nursing that accords with this guideline.¹⁵⁴ But, with God's help, we will again convey approved and suitable reminders concerning the raising of the child.¹⁵⁵

Collection TH₃: Letters of Theano

Theano to Euboule¹⁵⁶

Theano to Euboule. Greetings.¹⁵⁷

I hear that you are raising your children in luxury.¹⁵⁸ But the characteristic of a good¹⁵⁹ mother¹⁶⁰ is not care for the pleasure¹⁶¹ of her children, but rather guidance

¹⁵¹ This is the only occurrence of *κατάστροφος* cited in LSJ. It is, according to Städele, "Ein jedenfalls spätes Hapaxlegomenon" (*Die Briefe*, 278). For other reasons to date the letter of Myia to a time later than the letters of Melissa and Theano, see my discussion above of *P.Haun.* II.13.

¹⁵² This occurrence is cited in LSJ, s.v. *ἀπόσκληρος*.

¹⁵³ Extravagance (*πολυτελής*) in women's clothing is condemned in *Melissa to Kleareta* as well as in 1 Tim 2:9.

¹⁵⁴ *ὑφαγεόμενον* is a Doric form of *ὑφηγέομαι*, which connotes "go just before, guide, lead," LSJ, s.v. *ὑφηγέομαι*.

¹⁵⁵ The concluding reference to *τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῷ παιδός* is immediately picked up as the topic of the next letter (*ThE*): *Ἀκούω σε τὰ παιδία τρυφερῶς ἀγειν*; Euboule is then counseled to focus on *ἡ πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον ἀγωγή* (lines 3–4).

¹⁵⁶ The first few lines of this letter follow *Melissa to Kleareta* in *P.Haun.* II.13, ending with the phrase *βλέπε οὖν μή*.

¹⁵⁷ On the position of *χαίρειν*, see n. 107. Harper omits the greetings in her translation of *ThE* (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 42).

¹⁵⁸ The word *τρυφερῶς* here begins a persistent stress on the wrong kind of childrearing. Its cognate *τρυφερὰν* appears in line 34 and Euboule's "delicacy" is censured again in the last sentence, forming an *inclusio* with this adverb: *καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς*, line 42. All through the letter there is a contrast of good and bad childrearing, as emphasized by word-plays (*παρηχησεις* [sound-alike] and *παρανομασία* [etymological], Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §§ 3037, 3040), so that Euboule's incorrect *τρυφή* is contrasted with forms of *τρέφω* (lines 11 and 22) and forms of *τροφή* (lines 7 [3×], 15, 19, and 34). Städele notes that this admonition about "spoiling children" is "ein beliebtes Thema der kynisch-stoischen Diatribe ..." (*Die Briefe*, 293, where he also cites references from some of those works). Similar words for nourishment and child-rearing have already been seen in *Myia to Phyllis*, e.g., lines 5, 6, 9.

¹⁵⁹ At this point in the papyrus there is one long lacuna of ± 9 spaces between *ἀγαθῆς* and *μητρός* in line 45. Bülow-Jacobsen offers "There is just room for *καὶ σῶφρονος* in the lacuna (suggested by Holger Thesleff)" (*Papyri*, 10).

¹⁶⁰ This use of the genitive seems to fall somewhere into the categories described in Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 1303 (Predicate Use) or § 1304 (genitive with *εἰμί*).

¹⁶¹ Forms of *ἡδονή* are peppered throughout the letter: lines 3, 5, 6 (2×), 8 (*φιλήδονοι*), 9 (*ἡδυπαθεῖς*), 13, 16, 25, 29, 30, and 34.

to the moderate [way of life].¹⁶² Therefore, watch out, lest you do the work not of a loving mother, but of a flattering¹⁶³ one, for when pleasure is brought up together with children it makes them intemperate.¹⁶⁴ For what is more pleasant to the young than customary pleasure? Therefore, my dear,¹⁶⁵ the nurture of children must have no distortion.¹⁶⁶ Nurture is a distortion of nature when, loving pleasure in their souls, they live pleasurably in their bodies and, when shunning hardship in the former, they become softer in the latter.¹⁶⁷

It is necessary to train the children you are rearing with a view to fearful things, too, even if you must cause them grief or pain,¹⁶⁸ in order that they might not be slaves¹⁶⁹ of these emotions nor gluttonous¹⁷⁰ for pleasure nor apprehensive about pain, but so that they might honor noble things above all else, abstaining from the former,¹⁷¹ while remaining constant in the latter.¹⁷² Nor must one¹⁷³ make them fond of gorging¹⁷⁴ their food, or extravagant in pleasures, or intemperate in their

¹⁶² Taking τὸ σῶφρον as a substantive, since it has the article.

¹⁶³ This word may also be taken metaphorically as “softening” (LSJ, s.v. κολακέω), which contrasts nicely in English with the discussion of “hardships” (οἱ πόνοι).

¹⁶⁴ In the sense of “uncorrected,” “un-pruned” (i.e., the image of pruning grapevines at the end of the letter). ἀκολάστος is the opposite of σῶφρον in Plato *Grg.* 507c and Arist. *EN* 1117b, cited in LSJ, s.v. ἀκολάστος. The adverb ἀκολάστως is linked with τρυφερώς in Arist. *Pol.* 1.269b, LSJ, s.v. τρυφερός.

¹⁶⁵ I have translated φίλη as “dear,” rather than “friend,” in order to convey something of “Theano’s” superior role as teacher of the subordinate “Euboule.” This vocative address appears thirteen times in each of the three letters ascribed to Theano: four times in *Theano to Euboule*, six times in *Theano to Nikostrate*, and three times in *Theano to Kallisto*. The word is preceded by ὦ eight of the thirteen times; in these cases, I have translated the phrase “my dear.” The word is not used at all in any other texts ascribed to Pythagorean women, a small piece of evidence that the letters attributed to Theano may have come from a single author. I cannot discern any pattern to its use. It appears in statements of fact, warnings, and command. Twice in *Theano to Nikostrate* it is used within a short negation: μὴ σύ γε, ὦ φίλη (line 7) and μή, φίλη (line 62).

¹⁶⁶ The word διαστρόφῃν, “distortion,” also picks up the word-plays described in n. 156. Harper loses this connection in her translation “One must take care, my friend, lest the upbringing of one’s children become [sic] their downfall” (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 42).

¹⁶⁷ Here Hercher and Städele place the first paragraph break. This is a reasonable and helpful break, since the following statements explain more exactly what “training toward the *sōphrōn*” means. Also, the verb δεῖ helps to start a new idea in the instructions.

¹⁶⁸ This is the first of three references to “hard” circumstances (also lines 13 and 38).

¹⁶⁹ The word δοῦλα here is a neuter form of δούλος, in the adjectival meaning “slavish, servile, subject to.” I have translated it as a substantive adjective; cf. Thucydides 8.28, τὰ ἀνδράποδα πάντα καὶ δοῦλα καὶ ἐλεύθερα, LSJ, s.v. δούλος.

¹⁷⁰ Or, “curious,” “inquisitive.”

¹⁷¹ Presumably the various “passions.”

¹⁷² Meaning “the good things.”

¹⁷³ The infinitives that follow all hang on the δεῖ in line 11.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. LSJ, s.v. πλῆσμονικά. Städele says the word is found only once elsewhere, in Euthal. Diac. *Epp. Paul.* (PG 85.756B; 4th century CE) (*Die Briefe*, 294).

childish play without constraint, that is, by permitting them even to say anything or pursue anything, and moreover you are fearful if they cry, and feel honored if they laugh, and laugh if they strike the nurse and if they speak ill of you, and by providing cold during the summer, and heat during the winter, and much delicacy.¹⁷⁵ Poor children have no experience of these things, and they are reared easily, they grow no less, and are of a much stronger¹⁷⁶ disposition.¹⁷⁷ But you are nursing¹⁷⁸ your children like the offspring¹⁷⁹ of Sardanapallos,¹⁸⁰ emasculating the males' nature by pleasures. For what would someone make of a child who, if he does not eat right away, cries for food; and if he eats, searches for the choicest delicacies; and if he is hot, is weakened, and if cold, acts like a corpse;¹⁸¹ and if someone censures, he fights against it; and if someone does not serve at his pleasure, he is grieved; and if he is not contemptuous, he is bad-tempered, and is mischievous for pleasure, and goes around¹⁸² wriggling?¹⁸³

¹⁷⁵ Here the mother's activities are described through the participles "φοβουμένην ... φιλοτιμουμένην ... γελώσαν ... παρέχουσαν." Without a finite verb, Städele says, "scheinen die allgemein gehaltenen Vorschriften hier wieder in den Appell an die Mutter überzugehen," with the participles then reaching all the way back to the pronoun σε (line 2, then picked up in line 19) or to μητρή (lines 2–3) (ibid., 295). Since these descriptions of the mother are negative, it makes more sense to read the participles with reference to Euboule herself, therefore σε. Städele notes that Orelli decided that "der Verfasser des Briefes hier aus der Konstruktion fiel," and also cites Hercher's laconic remark "Oratio turbata" (ibid., 294–295; referring to C. Orelli, *Socratis et Socraticorum, Pythagorae et Pythagoreorum quae ferunter Epistolae* [Leipzig: In libraria Weidmannia, 1815]).

¹⁷⁶ Städele states that παρὰ πολὺ occasionally reinforces comparatives (ibid., 295).

¹⁷⁷ Hercher and Städele end the paragraph here. I have ignored the break because the author is continuing a rebuke of "Euboule's" mothering, showing where her indulgent practices will lead.

¹⁷⁸ A cognate of the word for wet-nurse, τίτθαν, in *Myia to Phyllis*.

¹⁷⁹ This poetic word, γονήν, is rarely found in later prose texts (so Städele, *Die Briefe*, 296).

¹⁸⁰ Städele notes the different ways of spelling this name (ibid., 295). An Assyrian ruler thought to have lived in the seventh century BCE, Sardanapallos became a legendary example of one who led an overly-luxurious life. More information is given on Sardanapallos in the compositional analysis of this letter.

¹⁸¹ πτωματίζει is a causative form, and the intransitive is rare. Städele discusses the possibility that "Wahrscheinlich ist deshalb nach ψῦχος [sic] ein Glied der Aussagekette ausgefallen" (ibid., 297). With others, he speculates it should be something like "The child throws himself to the ground" (ibid.).

¹⁸² Städele notes that this verb περιάγω appears in Mt 9:35, and has there a simple meaning of "umherziehen" ("to go about") (ibid., 297).

¹⁸³ The entry in LSJ for the verb βαταλίζεται states: "βαταλίζομαι, *live like a βάταλος*, Theano *Ep.* 1.3: later in Act., β. τὰ ὀπίσθια *wriggle*, of a horse, *Hippiatr.* 30." In the next entry, βάταλος is defined first as the equivalent of πρωκτός, which means "anus"; the second definition is "stammerer," LSJ, s.v. βάταλος. Whatever meaning is chosen, the intent is to describe negative social behavior. With children in mind, the word "wriggling" seems appropriate. Städele translates the phrase: "untätig herumtreibt" ["drifts about idly"] (*Die Briefe*, 169). I take the paragraph break here from Hercher and Städele because of the change from the description of the child's behavior to a direct address to the mother again.

Indeed, my dear, since you know that children who live in excessive comfort,¹⁸⁴ when they reach manhood, become slaves,¹⁸⁵ carefully¹⁸⁶ take away such pleasures as these by making their nurture rigorous and not delicate,¹⁸⁷ and by allowing them to bear hunger and thirst, as well as cold and heat, and shame from their peers and their superiors;¹⁸⁸ for thus it turns out that they are noble in soul¹⁸⁹ as well,¹⁹⁰ being either lifted up or censured.¹⁹¹ For hardships, dear, are sort of preliminary dyeing processes¹⁹² for children, so that virtue will be perfected: after they are dipped in them sufficiently, they bear the dye of virtue in a more suitable way. Therefore, look out, dear, lest just as the poorly-nurtured¹⁹³ grapevines produce defective fruit,¹⁹⁴ so also by luxury, your children may produce evil from insolence and utter worthlessness.¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁴ The children are described as τὰ σπαταλῶντα, “living softly,” “in excessive comfort or indulgence.” This occurrence along with that in 1 Tim 5:6 (ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα ζῶσα τέθνηκεν, there with respect to a “false” widow) are both cited in LSJ, s.v. σπαταλάω.

¹⁸⁵ Here the “manhood” (ἄνδρας) will warp into a “captive manhood” (ἀνδράποδα) or slavery. The word ἀνδράποδα is echoed in a vice list in 1 Timothy, which names ἀνδραποδισταί (“slave captors”) among the many kinds of people whom the law (νόμος) lies against (1:10).

¹⁸⁶ The adverb ἐπιμελῶς recalls the ἐπιμέλεια of line 3.

¹⁸⁷ The correct “nurture” (τροφήν) is contrasted by a wordplay with “delicate” (τρυφεράν), referring back to the opening of the letter; see again, n. 158.

¹⁸⁸ With the translation of this word ἐπιστάτης, I wanted to convey the idea of “superior” persons, without using “elders” (πρεσβύτερος) or “overseers” (ἐπίσκοπος) which are used in the Pastorals; persons with these labels would also be thought worthy of respect (αἰδώς) within the worldview of *Theano to Euboule*.

¹⁸⁹ Here some mss. have variations of αὐτὰ ψυχὴν, which Städele says suggests that “bereits der Archetyp an dieser Stelle eine Variante aufwies oder undeutlich korrigiert war ...” (*Die Briefe*, 300). He chooses κατὰ ψυχὴν because it is “‘a favourite phrase’ u.a. im Aristeasbrief” (ibid., citing H.G. Meecham, *The Letter of Aristeas* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935], 185).

¹⁹⁰ Taking συμβαίνει in the “philosophical” sense of “an attribute necessarily resulting from the notion of a thing ...,” LSJ, s.v. συμβαίνω. The “being noble” follows from the activities mentioned in the preceding sentence.

¹⁹¹ The antithesis ἀνατεινόμενα ἢ ἐπιτιμώμενα is similar to the process of praise and rebuke in moral-philosophical training.

¹⁹² This *hapax legomenon* is translated “astringent, hardening process,” LSJ, s.v. προὔποστ-φῆ; Städele gives related terms (*Die Briefe*, 301). I have used “preliminary” to get at the meaning of the prefix προὔπο-. This choice is appropriate because of the subsequent reference to the “dyeing” process, which is one of the meanings of the verb στύφω (along with “to be astringent”). This translation emphasizes the mother’s early role in moral training for children. It is a necessary step toward ensuring that children, when they grow up to manhood, will “bear the dye of virtue in a more suitable way,” as the statement concludes.

¹⁹³ αἱ κακοτροφούμεναι is cited in LSJ, s.v. κακοτροφέω.

¹⁹⁴ This is a free translation of τὸν καρπὸν ἐλλείπουσιν, drawing on the noun ἔλλειμμα, τό, which means “defect, deficiency,” LSJ, s.v. ἔλλειμμα. The phrase more literally reads: “(they) fail [or, fall short] with respect to fruit”; LSJ, s.v. ἐλλείπω.

¹⁹⁵ Harper adds in “Farewell” at the end of the letter, although it is not documented in the manuscripts (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 43).

Theano to Nikostrate

Theano to Nikostrate.¹⁹⁶ Greetings.¹⁹⁷

I keep hearing of the madness of your husband—that he has an *hetaira*¹⁹⁸—and you, in turn, regard him with jealous anger.¹⁹⁹ But my dear, I have known many men with this same illness; for it is as if they are hunted down and controlled by these women, and they lose their mind. But you are depressed both night and throughout the day, and in anguish and are contriving something against him.²⁰⁰ Don't do this, my dear! For the virtue of a married woman is not close surveillance of the husband, but rather companionship.²⁰¹ It is companionship to bear his foolish

¹⁹⁶ Nikostrate's name means something like "victorious soldier-woman," and prepares the way for other military references like *ἐχθροῖς* (line 36); *τὸν ἐχθρόν* (line 39); *συντετάχθαι* (line 51); *φυλαττομένη* (line 58); *μάχιμος* (line 58); *μάχεσθαι* (line 59); and *αἱ ... μάχαι* (line 60). Also, *εὐτάξια* (lines 30–31) and *σύνταξιν* (line 63) are evocative of an orderly line of battle.

¹⁹⁷ On the position of *χαίρειν*, see again n. 107.

¹⁹⁸ Given that the social roles of *hetairai* in the Roman world differentiate them from "common prostitutes" (*pornai*) of that time and ours, I have simply transliterated the word into English as a reminder of its ancient meaning. While "courtesan" is a frequently-encountered translation, I believe its meaning is not so clear to modern minds. For instance, in the index to his book *Roman Wives*, Winter lists "Prostitute (high class, *hetairai*)" (226); he repeats this "high class prostitute" label (*ibid.*, 22 n. 19; 47). In his translation of *Melissa to Kleareta* he transliterates *hetairai*, then adds "(call-girls)" (*ibid.*, 72). Later, he calls them "courtesans" (*ibid.*, 132, 154, 164). The index in *Families in the New Testament World* phrases it this way: "*hetairai* (cultured female companions) and prostitutes" (Osiek and Balch, 244). Another possible translation for *hetaira* is "mistress" (Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 74, 96–97). Pomeroy gives a general summary of "Prostitutes," including *hetairai*, in *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves*, 88–92, 139–141. There she states "Those at the top of this social scale [of prostitutes] were call *hetairai*, or 'companions to men'" (*ibid.*, 89). There is also the *παλλακή*, who is a "concubine," LSJ, s.v. *παλλακή*, another distinction that is hard to express in English. The subtle distinctions are explained by Demosthenes, *Contra Neaera* 59.122: "For we have *hetairai* for the sake of pleasure, the *pallakai* for the daily service of the body, but the wives to produce legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of things inside [the house]" (*τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἐταῖρας ἡδονῆς ἕνεκ' ἔχομεν, τὰς δὲ παλλακὰς τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν θεραπείας τοῦ σώματος, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως καὶ τῶν ἔνδον φύλακα πιστὴν ἔχειν*). Here *hetairai* and *pallakai* are not the same kind of women. The stark contrast between *hetaira* and wife is exactly the viewpoint of *Theano to Nikostrate*. A helpful article is Andrew Dalby's "Levels of Concealment: The Dress of *Hetairai* and *Pornai* in Greek Texts," in *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World* (London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2002), 111–124. Dalby consistently transliterates *hetairai*, while referring to a range of statuses that such women might inhabit; I analyze the situation of *hetairai* in Chapter Three.

¹⁹⁹ This is the first reference to the wife's supposed "jealous anger" (*ζηλοτυπείς*); "jealousy" is referred to again in lines 33, *ζηλοτυπητέον*; 34, *ζήλον*; and, in an *inclusio*, 62–63, *ζηλοτυπίας*.

²⁰⁰ Theano shows that she has "received" additional knowledge of Nikostrate's emotional state.

²⁰¹ This is a different kind of companionship than with the *hetaira*.

conduct.²⁰² Further, he has intercourse with a *hetaira* for pleasure, but with his wife for advantage.²⁰³ It is advantageous not to mix evil with evils, nor to add madness to madness.²⁰⁴

Some sins, dear, when they are censured²⁰⁵ are stirred up²⁰⁶ still more, but when they are kept still, indeed, they stop, as they say fire is extinguished by stillness.²⁰⁷ For if by censuring him when he wishes to escape your notice, you take off²⁰⁸ the veil of his passion, then he will perform his sin openly.²⁰⁹ But you think the love (lac. indicavi)²¹⁰ for²¹¹ your husband is not for goodness; for *this* is the gift

²⁰² Städele has corrected Thesleff's edition from *ἄνοιαν* (folly) to *ἄγνοιαν* (ignorance) (*Die Briefe*, 310–311). Either word nicely evokes the earlier suggestion that men in this situation suffer from “madness” (line 1) and act as if “they lost their mind” (οὐκ ἔχουσι νοῦν): their νοῦς is lacking; cf. also line 42, the use of *κατανοέω*.

²⁰³ The harm to Nikostrate's “advantage” (τὸ συμφέρον) is reiterated in line 51.

²⁰⁴ Here Hercher and Städele place a paragraph break. I have retained this arrangement because of the inclusio formed by the word *παράνοια*.

²⁰⁵ With the appearance of ἐλέγχειν here, Theano conceives of Nikostrate using a philosophical-rhetorical method to criticize her husband.

²⁰⁶ I translate as “stirred up” in order to convey the idea of “stirring up” coals from a fire.

²⁰⁷ I use “kept still” and “stillness,” which carry the sense in English of both silence and lack of movement.

²⁰⁸ Städele shows that ἐάν is transmitted in all the manuscripts, while ἀφαιρήσεις appears chiefly in inferior ones, so he substitutes ἀφαιρήσης (*ibid.*, 311). Thesleff has followed Hercher, reading ἀφαιρήσεις. I have followed Städele and translated the word as the subjunctive.

²⁰⁹ This sentence is confusing to translators, since it shifts attention from Nikostrate to her husband at its end, with the use of the future indicative ἀμαρτήσεται. Relying on Thesleff's and Hercher's edition, Waithe and Harper translate it: “Besides, though it seems that you wish to escape notice yourself, by condemning him you will take away the veil that covers your own condition. Then *you* will manifestly err ...” (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 44; my italics). Plant has: “In addition, although you seem to want to escape notice, if you condemn him you lift the veil from your own feelings. And clearly *you* will be making a mistake” (*Women Writers*, 73; my italics). Notice that both these translate βουλόμενον as if it applied to Nikostrate, although it is a masculine accusative participle. Likewise they translate ἀμαρτήσεται in the second person. Instead, in Städele's edition the sentence is a logically-constructed Future More Vivid condition: “If (ἐάν)” plus the subjunctive “you ... take off [ἀφαιρήσης],” followed by the future indicative “he will perform his sin [ἀμαρτήσεται] openly.” The author believes that Nikostrate's censuring of her husband will lead to the removal of the secrecy (here called a “veil”) of his affair and thus will cause his sin to come out in the open.

²¹⁰ Some words are missing here, but alternate reconstructions have not gained acceptance (Städele, *Die Briefe*, 312). Thesleff has retained the text as is, and it does make some sense as a censure of Nikostrate's wrong thinking about the purpose of marriage.

²¹¹ The genitive in the clause σὺ δὲ τὴν φιλίαν ἡγή (lac. indicavi) τοῦ ἀνδρός appears to be an objective genitive. This would correspond with Smyth's observation that the objective genitive “is very common with substantives [like φόβος, εὐνοια, συνουσία] denoting a frame of mind or an emotion [in this case, φιλία]” (*Greek Grammar*, §1331). Plant makes this sentence into a subjective genitive: “You believe the love of your husband is the behaviour of a gentleman” (*Women Writers*, 73) which does not seem likely given the criticism of the husband throughout.

of the partnership.²¹² Therefore, consider that he goes to the *hetaira* for careless amusement, but he is present with you to live a common life, and he loves you with intelligence, but that woman with passion.²¹³

Yet the time for this is short;²¹⁴ for it has its climax and then immediate satisfaction,²¹⁵ and it happens quickly and stops. Indeed, love for a *hetaira* is short-lived for a man who is not terribly wicked, since what is emptier than desire that gets its enjoyment from injustice?²¹⁶ For this reason he will notice at some point²¹⁷ that he is diminishing his life and slandering his own decency,²¹⁸ since no one who is prudent continues in a ruin of his own choosing. Therefore, when he is summoned by the just duties he has towards you and sees the depreciation of his life, then he will take notice of you, and because he cannot endure the outrage²¹⁹ of moral condemnation, he will quickly change his mind.²²⁰

But you, dear, do not live by responding²²¹ to *hetairai*, but by excelling in (your) orderly behavior²²² towards your husband, and in attentiveness²²³ toward your

²¹² If Theano is rectifying Nikostrate's perceptions of marriage, then this final clause, τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ χάρις τῆς κοινωνίας, must be emphasized as the correct understanding: "for *this* is the favor of partnership." This interpretation is supported by the sentence that follows, which contrasts the man's relationships with *hetaira* and wife.

²¹³ This is the second paragraph break made by Hercher and Städele, which I have kept because here the author turns from addressing Nikostrate's thinking to discuss the husband's failings.

²¹⁴ Here the theme of "brief time" enters the letter.

²¹⁵ The phrase here is transmitted as ἅμα γὰρ ποτε ἔχει but Hercher substituted ἀκμήν for ποτε, because the latter is odd and, says Städele, "kaum verständlich" (*Die Briefe*, 313). However, Städele has no firm solution, and so retains the change by Hercher.

²¹⁶ The theme of justice is taken up here and in lines 27 and 42; each time it is a negative evaluation of the husband's actions vis-à-vis his wife.

²¹⁷ According to Städele, even though the ms. tradition has here αἰσθήσεται ποτε, this is to be connected to a corruption in line 28, which repeats: αἰσθήσεται ποτέ σου. Städele points out that the repetition is not unusual for this author (καιρός in lines 21 and 23), so he allows the sentences to stand as transmitted (ibid., 314). Other repetitions are τὸν βίον in lines 25 and 27, and, though somewhat farther apart, τὰχὺ in lines 22 and 28.

²¹⁸ This word is repeated at line 49.

²¹⁹ ὕβρις is also the potential fruit that Euboule's children might produce, *ThE*, line 43.

²²⁰ A contrast of mentality is emphasized by the stem γινω which appears in both κατὰ γνώσεως and μεταγνώσεται. The suggested paragraph break here again signals a shift in the author's address, this time from the husband back to Nikostrate.

²²¹ I employ the English "responding" to indicate that by reacting to the *hetaira*, Nikostrate is allowing herself to be "controlled" by her. It could also mean "defending yourself" or "answering charges" by *hetairai*.

²²² For wifely εὐταξία, see also *Melissa to Kleareta*, lines 23–24.

²²³ For motherly ἐπιμελεία, see *Theano to Euboule*, lines 3, 32; also "inattention" to the household here in line 56.

household, in your dealings concerning female slaves,²²⁴ and in tender love²²⁵ concerning your children. Therefore, you must not be jealous of her (for it is right only to be jealous of virtuous women), and you should present yourself as disposed to reconciliation.²²⁶ For noble traits offer goodwill even with enemies, dear, and honor is a product of noble goodness alone, and by means of it a wife can surpass²²⁷ her husband in authority and give herself honor instead of serving the enemy.²²⁸

Therefore, when he is patiently attended²²⁹ by you he will be all the more ashamed, and he will wish to be reconciled quickly, and will love you more affectionately, since he has come to recognize²³⁰ his injustice toward you, because he comprehends²³¹ your attention to his way of life and receives the proof²³² of your love towards him. And just as evil sufferings²³³ of the body make their endings pleasant, so the differences between lovers bring about more intimate reconciliations.²³⁴

But resist the counsels²³⁵ of your suffering! For since he is ill, they encourage²³⁶ you also to become ill in your griefs. And because he is sinning against his own

²²⁴ περὶ τὰς χρωμένας could also possibly be “dealings with your friends,” LSJ, s.v. χράω. However, with this listing of a woman's household roles, a reference to female slaves would certainly be expected. The letter thus addresses in quick succession the main subjects of household management: the female equivalents of the three relationships of husband-wife, father-child, master-slave, and the fourth component of wealth (here compressed into the “attentiveness toward your household”); cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.2–5 for his thinking on these “things”.

²²⁵ φιλοστοργία used especially for familial affection; see also φιλοστοργήσει, line 41; also, στοργή, line 43.

²²⁶ συναλλαγὴ connotes “making of peace,” and in the plural, a “treaty of peace,” LSJ, s.v. συναλλαγή.

²²⁷ Städele accepts here the emendation καθυπερέχειν taken over by Hercher, against “die einhellige Überlieferung,” apparently because it is a common enough word, and is used in the *Oikonomikos* of Callicratidas, another Pythagorean (*Die Briefe*, 316). This paragraphing indicates that once again the author has switched from advising Nikostratē to predicting her husband's behavior.

²²⁸ Städele sums up two possible ways to deal with τὸν ἐχθρόν here: (1) to read it as a highly abbreviated form of argumentation (“to serve [her husband as] the enemy”); or (2) that a scribal error was made, and καθάπερ (from line 38) should have been attached to ἐχθρόν rather than ἔχειν. He finds problems with both solutions, and leaves this unresolved (*ibid.*, 316–317).

²²⁹ The passive κατερούμενος is unusual, but transmitted in almost all the manuscripts (*ibid.*, 317).

²³⁰ Another term (συγγιγνώσκω) built on the stem γινω-.

²³¹ The verb κατανόεω can also mean “to be in one's right mind, in one's senses,” LSJ, s.v. κατανόεω, which fits quite nicely with the author's assertion at the beginning of the letter that the husband suffers from a *paranoia*, and that men “hunted down and controlled” by *hetairai* act as if “they lost their mind.” “Theano” promises that this husband will come back to his right mind.

²³² πείρα used with λαμβάνω may mean to “make *trial* or *proof* of,” LSJ, s.v. πείρα.

²³³ Here κακοπάθειαι picks up again the focus on πάθος.

²³⁴ This paragraph break marks yet another switch in address from husband to wife.

²³⁵ Städele notes that the phrase τὰ βουλευόμενα τοῦ πάθους sets up the introduction of the example of Medea in lines 62 ff. (*Die Briefe*, 318).

²³⁶ Here παρακαλέω is used in an ironic way, as the opposite of proper παράκλησις.

decency,²³⁷ [they encourage] you also to sin against your decorum. And since he is greatly harming his life, [they encourage] you also to greatly harm your advantage. From these things, you will seem to have lined up against him, and by punishing him, you punish yourself as well. For although²³⁸ you might go and get divorced, then you will try your fortune²³⁹ with another man after being divorced from²⁴⁰ the first man, and if that man transgresses in similar ways, again [you will try] yet another man (for widowhood²⁴¹ is not bearable for young women), or you will remain alone without a man—that is to say, very unmarried.²⁴²

But will you neglect your household and destroy your husband? *Then* you will share²⁴³ the damage of a painful life. But will you revenge yourself on the *hetaira*?²⁴⁴ Being on her guard, she will go around you, and when she wards you off,²⁴⁵ a woman who does not blush²⁴⁶ is a good fighter. But is it good to fight every day with your husband? And for what reason? For fights and reproaches do not stop

²³⁷ See paragraph 3 for a similar assessment of the husband's behavior, using related words.

²³⁸ The εἰ ... καὶ clause here is regularly translated as a “real concession” (“although”): “εἰ καὶ commonly admits that a condition exists (*granting that*), but does not regard it as a hindrance. The condition, though it exists, is a matter of no moment so far as the statement in the principal clause is concerned” (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 2375). Such a translation makes sense in this sentence, given the relative ease with which a wife could obtain a divorce under Roman law. However, here the author immediately exhorts *against* divorce, by painting a picture of a sad and lonely divorcée.

²³⁹ Although πειραθήσῃ is the future passive, I have adopted a suggestion from LSJ of “*try one's fortune*” for the middle. I think such a translation works here because of the idea that “fortune” might be an unnamed influence on a woman's choice of husband. One instance of the passive is found in *Iliad*, 23.553: “περὶ δ' αὐτῆς πειρηθήτω (sc. τῆς ἵππου) *let him try for her, as a prize.*” As here, the verb often takes the genitive of person or thing being tried or tested; LSJ, s.v. πειράω.

²⁴⁰ ἀπαλλάσσω in the passive can mean “*to be set free, or released from a thing, get rid of it,*” and thus “*to be divorced,*” LSJ, s.v. ἀπαλλάσσω.

²⁴¹ Note that “widowhood” (χρηρεία) is here applied to divorced women; see next note and discussion of this label in Chapter Three.

²⁴² The enclitic particle περ intensifies the word ἄζυξ (which literally means “unyoked,” “unpaired”), and suggested translations are “very much, however much,” “very,” “at any rate.” The author emphasizes here the acute social undesirability of a woman remaining in the unmarried state, whether because she was widowed or divorced. The paragraph break here marks where the author turns to a series of rhetorical questions addressed to the wife.

²⁴³ Here I read συνδιαίρήσῃ as the future middle indicative, rather than the aorist subjunctive.

²⁴⁴ I am taking ἀμυνεῖ as the future middle indicative, 2nd singular of ἀμύνω, meaning in the middle: “*avenge oneself on an enemy*: hence, *requite, repay,*” LSJ, s.v. ἀμύνω. Throughout the letter, the *hetaira* is seen as a military enemy of the wife.

²⁴⁵ This form of ἀμύνω is taken as the aorist active subjunctive, 3rd singular, and comprises a word-play with the middle form just discussed in n. 245. The linguistic metaphor is that the wife is on the “defensive” (exemplified in the middle voice,) while the *hetaira* is taking the “offensive” (in the active voice), as reiterated in the description of her as μάχημος.

²⁴⁶ This recalls the advice in *Melissa to Kleareta* where a “natural blush” is to adorn the face of a sôphrôn woman (lines 15–16). Here the *hetaira* possesses no such modesty.

intemperance,²⁴⁷ but they increase the disagreement by their advance.²⁴⁸ So what? Will you plan something against him? No, dear. Tragic dramas, in which Medea acted unlawfully, have taught (us) to master jealous anger²⁴⁹ by keeping it in order.²⁵⁰ But just as one should keep one's hands away from an eye infection, thus also you must set aside the claim of your suffering,²⁵¹ for by bearing patiently, you will extinguish²⁵² his passion more quickly.²⁵³

Theano to Kallisto

Theano to Kallisto.²⁵⁴

Indeed, authority has customarily been given to you younger women to rule over the household slaves²⁵⁵ once you have been married, but the teaching ought to come from the older women because they are forever giving advice about household management. For it is good first to learn the things you do not know and to consider the counsel of the older women the most suitable; for a young soul must be brought up in these teachings from girlhood.²⁵⁶ And the first rule women have over the household is that over the female slaves. My dear, goodwill is of greatest importance in slave relations; for this commodity is not purchased along with their bodies, but later astute owners engender it.²⁵⁷

²⁴⁷ ἀκολασία is used as the opposite of σωφροσύνη, LSJ, s.v. ἀκολασία. Here it seems to refer to the husband's behavior, not that of the wife.

²⁴⁸ προκοπή must be meant ironically here, given its connection to moral-philosophical progress, as explained by John T. Fitzgerald ("The Passions and Moral Progress: An Introduction," in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought* [ed. John T. Fitzgerald; Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies (New York; London: Routledge, 2008)]: 12–16).

²⁴⁹ Although the form ζηλοτυπίας may be either genitive singular or accusative plural, κρατέω takes the genitive. Jealousy was identified as Nikostrate's main problem in line 3; the author's advice is summed up in the phrase: "to master jealous anger by keeping in order."

²⁵⁰ σύνταξις might also continue the military motifs of the letter.

²⁵¹ A word play begins here with τοῦ πάθους (Nikostrate's "suffering"), while the next occurrence of τὸ πάθος is that "passion" which the husband is indulging. Fitzgerald describes English translation options and problems for πάθος ("Passions and Moral Progress," 2–5).

²⁵² σβέσεις recalls the extinguishing of a fire in lines 13–14: ὡς τὸ πῦρ ἡσυχία φασὶ σβέννυσθαι.

²⁵³ Nikostrate is reminded again of the fleeting nature of her husband's attachment to the *hetaira*.

²⁵⁴ There is no χαίρειν present in the manuscripts; see again n. 107.

²⁵⁵ Here the genitive plural τῶν οἰκετῶν does not allow to distinguish between male and female slaves, but the rest of the letter uses feminine nouns for these persons. Neither is there a distinction between household slaves owned by the husband and the wife.

²⁵⁶ The unusual verb combines the noun παρθένης with the verb for childrearing: τροφέω. This instance cited in LSJ, s.v. παρθενοτροφέω.

²⁵⁷ This sentence functions as a thesis statement for the letter. The first paragraph break (retained from Hercher and Städele) signals the author's move to the two grounds that engender "goodwill": (1) just use, and (2) just discipline.

Just employment²⁵⁸ is the cause of this: so that they might neither be distressed on account of their labor nor be incapacitated on account of their need, for they are human beings by nature. Some women consider as profit what is most unprofitable, namely, the maltreatment of their female slaves: oppressing them with tasks, while in turn reducing their provisions.²⁵⁹ Then, saving for themselves petty profits, they suffer losses in great penalties: the worst disaffections and plots. But as for you, let there be a ready measure of grain²⁶⁰ corresponding to the amount of wool-working for each day's tasks.²⁶¹

So much for the diet. Now, as to disorderly conduct, one must supply²⁶² what is fitting for you, not what is advantageous for them. For you must value²⁶³ female slaves according to their worth; for indeed cruelty in anger will not bring favor,²⁶⁴ but reason does not judge spite any the less. But if the excess of their wickedness cannot be conquered, then one must banish them for sale. For let what is estranged from useful service also be estranged from its *kyria*.²⁶⁵ Let judgment have pride of place in this matter with you; by it you will, on the one hand, distinguish the truth of the infraction in relation to what is just condemnation and, on the other, distinguish the extent of the infractions committed in relation to what is worthy of punishment.²⁶⁶ But also the superior²⁶⁷ judgment of the lady of the house²⁶⁸ removes the penalty from the infractions that have been committed, and thus in this way²⁶⁹

²⁵⁸ I have translated *χρησις* as “employment” in order to convey the meaning of slaves as “tools” to be “used” or “employed” by their owners.

²⁵⁹ The sentence *βαρύνουσαι μὲν τοῖς ἔργοις, ὑποστελλόμεναι δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων* (lines 15–16) explains the sentence at the beginning of the paragraph “so that they might not be distressed on account of their labor [which is “oppressive”] or be incapable on account of their need [having reduced provisions].”

²⁶⁰ *σιτίων* could also be “food made from grain,” LSJ, s.v. *σιτίον*.

²⁶¹ The second paragraph break by Hercher and Städele signals a change in topic.

²⁶² This instance cited in LSJ, s.v. *ἐξυπηρετέω*.

²⁶³ The word *τιμᾶν* when used toward slaves seems to me to convey that they are property to be “valued,” rather than persons to be “honored.”

²⁶⁴ That is, the *despoina*'s cruel treatment of slaves in anger will not “engender goodwill,” or, “bring favor,” as it is called here.

²⁶⁵ *Kyria* is one of the titles given to the female head of household, which I have transliterated in order to avoid the English “mistress.” Unlike “master,” this word has taken on an illicit sexual connotation. Likewise, “housewife” does not get across the power these women had over slaves. Perhaps “Lady” (as with “Lord”) would work, but it sounds too civilized, and less “despotic.”

²⁶⁶ Hercher and Städele place another paragraph break here, but I have removed it because the author is still instructing about just punishment of disorderly conduct by slaves.

²⁶⁷ *δεσποτική* could be literally translated as “despotic,” but that has a more political connotation in English.

²⁶⁸ Städele notes changes made by Hercher and Thesleff in order to make sense of this line, but he believes that *χάρις* is simply a marginal gloss that became incorporated into the manuscript tradition (*Die Briefe*, 328).

²⁶⁹ Here the manuscripts read “καὶ τοῦ τρόπου,” but Städele reconstructs the original phrase as *κατὰ τὸν τρόπον* (ibid., 328).

she will guard carefully what is fitting for her own household. For some women, my dear, from cruelty even whip the bodies of their female slaves, becoming brutal²⁷⁰ because of jealousy or anger, just as if they were inscribing a record of the excess of their bitterness. For in time, some slaves, being worn out, have been destroyed, and others procured their deliverance by escape, and others stopped living, set free by death at their own hand, and finally, the solitary state of the *despoina*,²⁷¹ in lament over her own²⁷² thoughtlessness, possesses a desolate regret.²⁷³

But, my dear, be an imitator²⁷⁴ of the musical instruments,²⁷⁵ which are in discord when more loosened, but are caused to break²⁷⁶ when more tightened, and this is also the case with the female slaves.²⁷⁷ For too much loosening²⁷⁸ produces discord in (their) obedience to authority, but the tightening of constraint, dissolution of the nature.²⁷⁹ And in this regard, you must keep in mind that proportion²⁸⁰ is best in all things. Farewell.

²⁷⁰ Or, “become like a wild beast”; the verb θηριόω is a cognate of θηράω, both of which have negative connotations when describing the *hetaira*’s hunt for men in *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Nikostrate*.

²⁷¹ I have chosen to transliterate ἡ δεσποῖνα (the feminine of δεσπότης).

²⁷² The use of οἰκείαν here reminds the reader that the issue is the *despoina*’s household (οἰκία) context, and echoes especially the οἰκ- language from the first paragraph (τῶν οἰκετῶν, τῆς οἰκονομίας, τὴν συμβουλὴν οἰκειοτάτην, οἴκου). Her household, once bustling with activity, is now “desolate” (ἐρημον).

²⁷³ Here the paragraph break suggested by Hercher and Städele makes sense because the author switches to a direct address to the addressee, and provides a short summary of the advice.

²⁷⁴ ἴσθι μιμουμένη τὰ ὄργανα, the only direct command to imitation in the Pythagorean letters. It is actually the female slaves who are likened to “instruments” that need careful tuning; see the next note on the use of ὄργανον for a slave in Aristotle, *Pol.*1254a.

²⁷⁵ τὰ ὄργανα here plays on the idea of slaves as “living instruments” of household property, see analysis below using Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.2.4.

²⁷⁶ This use cited in LSJ, s.v. ἐκρήσσω; for causing an abscess to burst, cf. Paulus Aegineta (medical writer of the seventh c. CE).

²⁷⁷ This example of the too lax or too tight winding of stringed instruments illustrates clearly the need for “proportion” (μέτρον).

²⁷⁸ The word ἀνεσις refers specifically to the loosening of strings of instruments; LSJ, s.v. ἀνεσις.

²⁷⁹ The phrase διάλυσιν τῆς φύσεως gives some idea of the damage done to a female slave who is too tightly controlled. The meaning of φύσις varies: “nature,” “natural form,” “character,” “instinct,” “creation,” “creature,” “substance,” “kind, sort, species,” LSJ, s.v. φύσις.

²⁸⁰ I have translated μέτρον as “proportion” in order to retain some of the idea of a mathematical measure; LSJ, s.v. μέτρον. This word is, of course, similar to the συμμετρία of the environment advised for an infant in *Myia to Phyllis*, line 27. Thom gives further discussion of these terms in Pythagorean texts where he translates συμμετρία as “due proportion” (“The Passions in Neopythagorean Writings,” 67–78).

CHAPTER TWO

FEMALE PYTHAGOREAN TEACHERS

PSEUDEPIGRAPHY AND THE PYTHAGOREAN WOMEN'S LETTERS

Each of these letters is attributed to an illustrious, respectable female philosopher; each pseudonymous authorial designation is meant to capture the attention of readers as well as to add to the letter's instructional influence.¹ "Theano" and "Myia" are known as historical women of the past, members of Pythagoras' family and also students of his philosophy. The name "Melissa" draws not only on historical personages, but also appeals to the personification of her namesake, the bee, especially its virtue, efficiency, and hive society. That these three names have been attached to *letters*, as opposed to some other textual form, lends a sense of intimacy to the written communication. Some of the attraction to ancient audiences must have been the idea of "reading over the shoulder" of the named recipient, as a means of gaining insight into the famous author's "private" thoughts.² Thus, the renown attached to the Pythagorean women's names would have attracted a reading audience interested in their ideas and perhaps intrigued by the possibility of examining their personal opinions more closely.

Three interrelated aspects of the names contribute to their appeal as epistolary pseudonyms: first, the women's historical-metaphorical fame;

¹ In the Greek letter-form, this name is the very first piece of information a reader acquires from the text itself. The name thus acts as a sort of "advertising" for the letters, much as a theater marquee lists the stars of a production.

² I take this phrase from Rosenmeyer, who describes the process of reading letters: "For the epistolary exercise to succeed, we the audience—both ancient and modern readers—need to feel included in the correspondence. We may feel included and implicated by the simple act of 'reading over the shoulder,' or peeking into someone else's letter files" (*Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 307). As Rosenmeyer humorously comments: "So many of these pseudonymous texts have survived from antiquity that we can safely assume an eager reading public Whether the authors intended to deceive, or whether the ancient readers actually were deceived, are impossible questions to answer; but the appeal of reading someone else's personal mail is undeniable" (*Ancient Greek Literary Letters*, 7). She later expands on this idea: "The urge to read the private words of remarkable people reveals a kind of antiquarian interest similar to our own contemporary fascination with the diaries and private correspondence of former heads of state ..." (*ibid.*, 98).

second, a convenient lack of historical specificity about them, especially as composers of texts; and third, their “femininity,” i.e., that these are the names of *women*.³ In the textual roles of advisors and critics, the three selected names depend upon an implicit authorization of these women as teachers of and role models for the named recipients, and even serve to elevate common sense advice into the realm of a moral philosophy for women.

Scholarship on the letters attributed to Pythagorean women at first presumed the historical veracity of their named authors. The manuscript tradition does not question this point,⁴ and neither does Gilles Ménage’s *History of Women Philosophers*, which dates to the seventeenth century.⁵ Later on, the authorship of the letters (along with many other tracts ascribed to Pythagoreans) was doubted on linguistic⁶ and ideological⁷ grounds, as well as historical⁸ comparisons to early Pythagoreanism and other philosophical movements and literature.⁹

However, a second scholarly claim was made regarding the pseudonymity of the Pythagorean women’s texts: not only were the authors’ names believed to be falsified, but it was thought that the texts ascribed to women were actually written by men. Sarah B. Pomeroy remarks that “The arguments against female authorship consists [sic] of two parts: (1) the names of the women authors are pseudonyms, and (2) the treatises were written by men using pseudonyms.”¹⁰ Pomeroy traces the idea of male authorship

³ Rosenmeyer posits a similar fascination with the collection of Alciphron’s nineteen letters of courtesans, but that he was the real author is not questioned. Comparing this collection with Lucian’s *Dialogues of Courtesans*, she says, “Both offer the ... thrill of overhearing (or reading over the shoulder) what these women really talk about, especially, in the case of Alciphron, when men are not present” (*Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 264; further analysis given there in ch. 10, esp. 272–277, 282–285, 298–307).

⁴ For a catalog of published editions of the letters (up through that of Thesleff), see Städele, *Die Briefe*, 137–145; cf. also his annotations on translations, 145–147.

⁵ On the four letters in *Vat. Gr.* 578 Ménage conjectures: “I would not dare to say that all of those letters are not from Theano, the wife of Pythagoras. It is certain that this letter of which we speak [*Theano to Rhodope*] is not from his wife. For in this letter Theano excused herself to Rhodope because she had not yet sent to her Plato’s book on Ideas, entitled the *Parmenides*. Theano, the wife of Pythagoras, lived many years before Plato” (*The History of Women Philosophers*, 62).

⁶ The fact that many of the texts have been transmitted in an inconsistent Doric dialect.

⁷ Most of the texts, including the women’s writings, do not exhibit much interest in the theories of early Pythagoreanism, as known from Aristotle and other early sources.

⁸ The texts are dated much later than the sixth century BCE date for Pythagoras’ life.

⁹ Thesleff summarizes the earlier scholarship on Pythagorean pseudepigrapha (*Introduction*, 30–41).

¹⁰ *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 64. By “treatises” she means these letters as well as the treatises attributed to Periktione and Phintys.

at least as far back as Richard Bentley, who “apparently did not believe this report about women’s participation [in the Pythagorean movement] at all: in a discussion of the authenticity of a Neo-Pythagorean treatise ascribed to Perictione, he wrote, ‘[The forgers of treatises simply] thought it a point of decorum, to make even the female kindred of philosophers copy after the men.’”¹¹

Based on his dating of the letters (leaning toward the first-second centuries CE), Alfons Städele assumes that all five are pseudepigraphical, in both author and addressee: “Die Vorwegnahme dieses Untersuchungsergebnisses, daß nämlich die Briefe nicht ‘echt’ sind, sei erlaubt. Sie sind dennoch insofern pythagoreisch, als Maß und Einsicht in ihnen wie in vielen eklektizistischen neupythagoreischen Schriften zentrale Anliegen darstellen”¹² Instead, Städele theorized that the names were chosen based on the prominence of women in the early Pythagorean communities:

Wenn diese Belehrungen gerade von Pythagoreerinnen verfaßt sein sollen, so einmal deshalb, weil Frauen in der pythagoreischen Gemeinschaft eine herausragende Rolle spielten, zum andern, weil von Melissa, Myia, Theano wie von anderen Philosophenfrauen und -töchtern ein Eintreten für die weibliche Sittsamkeit erwartet werden konnte.¹³

Such woman-to-woman communication has a special fascination for readers, a fact that speaks in favor of pseudepigraphy:

Dazu darf im Hinblick auf mögliche Leser ein Gesichtspunkt nicht gering veranschlagt werden, den F. Wilhelm in Zusammenhang mit anderen pseudopythagoreischen Schriften geäußert hat: “Das Wohlgefallen des Lesers an

¹¹ Ibid., 65. On her page 191 n. 132, she cites Bentley’s *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* (1699; London: 1816), 304.

¹² *Die Briefe*, 252, n. 4. He, too, cites classicist Mario Meunier: “Les lettres I, II, III de Théano, peuvent, à la rigueur, passer pour être ‘authentique’” (*Femmes Pythagoriciennes: Fragments et Lettres de Théano, Périclioné, Phintys, Mélissa et Myia* [Paris: L’Artisan du Livre, 1932], 30). The idea of pseudonymity became generally accepted by scholars, as can be seen in the comments from Meunier. In his 1932 French translation of the letters and treatises by Pythagorean women, along with introductory remarks, he stated: “Quant aux lettres de Théano, de Mélissa et de Myia, dont la traduction suit celle des fragments de Périclioné et de Phintys, la critique moderne les considère généralement comme apocryphes; mais ces apocryphes, comme le remarque E. Egger, ‘sont des apocryphes anciens, très anciens peut-être’ [citing a letter of E. Egger to Clarisse Bader, Meunier, *Femmes Pythagoriciennes*, 28, n. 2]. L’anonymat d’ailleurs, dans le Pythagorisme, comme dans toutes les antiques écoles dont l’enseignement se transmettait initialement, était de tradition. Pythagore ne nous a laissé aucun écrit sous son nom Le seul fait que ces lettres, tout comme les fragments dont nous avons parlé, soient signées d’un nom particulier indique qu’elles faisaient partie de la doctrine exotérique ou publique de l’Ordre” (ibid., 28–30).

¹³ *Die Briefe*, 252–253.

diesem Frauenspiegel ... erhöht sich durch die Fiktion, dass es selbst Frauen sind, die hier der Weiblichkeit, d.h. der γυνή ἐλευθέρα ..., Gesetze geben."¹⁴

While he does not treat the question of whether a man or a woman stands behind the female pseudonyms, Städele perhaps betrays his assumption in statements that refer to an author as "he."¹⁵

For some decades most scholars adopted this double assumption: the authorial inscriptions (and presumably the names of the recipients) of the letters¹⁶ (and treatises) were pseudonymous, and these "women's" texts were actually written by men.¹⁷ The reasons for postulating male authors behind the female pseudonyms of the Pythagorean women's letters and treatises are not entirely clear. Does it go back to Richard Bentley's belief that women were not really active in early Pythagoreanism? Did other assumptions intrude? For example, were women thought incapable of writing such texts, or any texts at all? Was this conclusion based on historical evidence about women's literacy in the ancient world? Was it prompted by the absolute rarity of female authors and female recipients? Again, the suppositions of his earlier scholarship remain uncertain.

However, a theory of *female* authorship of the Pythagorean women's texts emerged in the mid-1980s, beginning with Pomeroy's *Women in Hellenistic Egypt* (1984). The motivation for such a change in opinion appears to be the modern feminist realization of the texts' distinctive historical status: "These works constitute the only extant body of Greek prose literature

¹⁴ Ibid., 253; citing Wilhelm, "Die Oeconomica der Neupythagoreer Bryson, Kallikratidas, Periktione, Phintys," in *RhM N.F.* 70 (1915), 161–223.

¹⁵ On *Theano to Nikostrate*: "Der Verfasser beherrschte die traditionellen Gesetze der Rhetorik, war aber kein Attizist. Daß er mit seiner Argumentation, ... er ein durch die Tradition vorgegebenes Thema ... unter einem neuen Aspekt abzuhandeln versuchte Mit dem Brief wählte er dafür ein geeignetes Genos, mit der Philosophin Theano eine passende Verfasserin" (*Die Briefe*, 308–309; my italics).

¹⁶ It should be noted that most scholars consider the pseudonymity of the authors of the Pythagorean women's letters along with that of the treatises attributed to Periktione and Phintys. As already explained, by virtue of their related textual transmission and their common genre, I confine my analysis to the authorship of the letters.

¹⁷ For instance, Pomeroy states: "The authors are at least as likely to have actually been male, but this cannot be proven" (*Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves* [1975, repr. 1995], 133–134). She cites no source for this conclusion. Later, Pomeroy argues *against* the theory that men wrote under women's names (*Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 61, 64–71). Other influential works that hold this view include: Lefkowitz and Fant (*Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, 2nd ed., 163). Two texts by New Testament scholars mention the possibility of male authorship citing the Pythagorean women's texts: Bassler (*1 Timothy*, 2 *Timothy*, *Titus*, 195) and Osiek and Balch (*Families in the New Testament World*, 168).

attributed to women in the pre-Christian era¹⁸ Contradicting her presumption in *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves*—that the Pythagorean texts were pseudonymously written by men using women's names, or possibly by unknown women¹⁹—Pomeroy now claims: "It is likely that the names are authentic, for, as a declaration of principle, Neopythagoreans would give their daughters names that occurred in the Pythagorean tradition."²⁰

The most concentrated rebuttal to the theory that the texts are pseudepigraphical by male authors followed in the first volume of *A History of Women Philosophers: Ancient Women Philosophers, 600 B.C.–500 A.D.*, edited by the philosopher Waithe in 1987.²¹ In this volume, Waithe includes not only the texts attributed to Pythagorean women, but also legendary evidence about women in the life of Pythagoras. Waithe addresses the authorship of the Pythagorean women's texts in a chapter entitled "Authenticating the Fragments and Letters," which leaves no doubt as to her own opinion: "... the words [of the Pythagorean women's texts] are eponymous: they were

¹⁸ *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 61; my italics. Pomeroy considers the Pythagorean texts under a section called "Education" in chapter 2, "Alexandrian Women" (41–82).

¹⁹ First asserted in the 1975 edition, and retained in the 1995 revised edition, 133–134.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 64. Note that here "authentic" means simply "Pythagorean." Pomeroy does not think that the original Theano, Myia, and Melissa, whoever they might have been, wrote the letters. Pomeroy also pulls in Iamblichus' list of "famous Pythagorean women" and other historical records of female participants in Pythagoras' movement as substantiation for women's authorship of the texts (*ibid.*, 64–65).

²¹ Waithe's stated goal was "*to restore women's contributions to the history of philosophy through a program of careful research and scholarship. The purpose of the research was to rediscover previously lost works of women philosophers and make information about those works available in a format that would be useful for students as well as scholars*" (*History of Women Philosophers*, X; my italics). She also says that her initial research led her to conclude "that the accomplishments of some one hundred or more women philosophers had been omitted from the standard philosophic reference works and histories of philosophy If the women are mentioned at all, it is in passing, in a footnote" (*ibid.*, X). I have used Waithe's own words to describe her purpose for writing this history because I believe it accounts for her intense interest in the question of pseudepigraphy of the Pythagorean letters. If she cannot give some argument that the Pythagorean texts were indeed written by women, and preferably by the named authors, then she loses almost all of her earliest evidence for women philosophers, nearly 800 years worth by her dating, specifically everything before the life of Hypatia of Alexandria (who died ca. 415 CE). Although Waithe's volume is flawed (as reviewers have amply noted), I attempt to summarize her work here because it provides the basis for so many later studies. For names of ancient Pythagoreans, Waithe used the texts by Ménage and Thesleff as sources. Oddly enough for my purposes, neither Waithe nor Harper mention or translate *Melissa to Kleareta*, even though they have used Ménage and Thesleff, who both include Melissa among the names of Pythagorean women.

written by the named authors.”²² Waithe raises the following objections to the proposition of pseudonymity by a *male author*:

Why would a male author, of Archytas’ or any other school, give his work a female *nom-de-plume*? How could a male philosopher hope to give his views a ring of authority by attributing them to virtually unknown authors, and female authors at that? The only conceivable circumstance that would induce a male to write under a female pen name is that the name really was that of a famous woman philosopher Our authors are virtually unknown except for Theano. ... The proponent of the pseudonymy hypothesis must be willing to claim that these women were early Pythagoreans of substantial initial fame and subsequent total obscurity who were memorialized by writers of fragments later attributed to them.²³

In this argument, Waithe exhibits a lack of consistency regarding the relative notoriety of the named female Pythagorean authors (including Arignote, Myia, Periktione, and Phintys): she has decided that, except for Theano, they were not famous. Waithe seems to make this exception for Theano because of the quantity of materials written about her and under her name.²⁴

Furthermore, Waithe does not carefully distinguish the two aspects of the presumed pseudepigraphy of the Pythagorean women’s writings: pseudonymity in general, and *male* authorship in particular. She appears to leap to the conclusion that by rejecting the idea that men took on women’s names, she is able to rebut the supposition of pseudepigraphy as a whole. That may be due to her assumption that since ancient pseudepigraphy was a “peculiar literary convention in which a writer attributes his or her work to a virtually unknown author as a way of giving that work a ring of authority, the far simpler hypothesis is the known literary convention of putting one’s own name to one’s writings.”²⁵ But pseudepigraphy in and of itself is not at all “peculiar” in the Greco-Roman literary world, although this scholarship seems to lie outside Waithe’s field of knowledge.²⁶

²² Ibid., 59. Later she says “... the ideas contained in these texts, if not the inscribed texts themselves, represent the ideas of the women philosophers who are named as their authors ...” (ibid., 73). Here Waithe (relying on a tautology) has added a note of ambiguity by her distinction between the “ideas” and the “inscribed texts” of the women philosophers.

²³ Ibid., 64.

²⁴ Ibid., 60–62. However, because Waithe believes in the historical authenticity of “Theano” as the author of all these letters and texts, she posits there are two “Theanos”: (1) the Crotonian woman who was indeed Pythagoras’ wife, who lived in the fourth c. BCE; and (2) a woman by the same name to whom Waithe assigns the letters, describing her as “late Pythagorean” (12–25, 41–55). On a timeline in this volume, Waithe places “Theano II” as living sometime between 300 BCE and the turn of the Common Era (2–3).

²⁵ Ibid., 64.

²⁶ As noted in Gillian Clark’s review of *A History of Women Philosophers*: “... the ancient

Yet Waithe is quite correct that if that were a characteristic of Greco-Roman pseudepigraphy it would be a “peculiar” practice for authors to choose to write under the names of *unknown* women. One of the more salient reasons given to explain the composition of ancient pseudepigraphical texts, including the New Testament and other early Christian literature, is that their authors (and/or editors) wanted to claim the authority of persons revered in their respective traditions.²⁷ Waithe’s project has foundered on this central point: she has not adequately examined the Pythagorean women’s writings within either their literary (pseudepigraphical) or historical (Pythagorean) contexts.²⁸ Had she done so, she would have discovered an abundance of pseudepigrapha produced by philosophers of all sorts who wrote texts by famous personages as a means to transmit their traditions, as instruments for debate, and as parts of instructional curricula. This means there are other “conceivable circumstances” than the one that Waithe proposes.

world, unfortunately, is not W.’s strong point, and the results are uneven” (*The Classical Review*, New Ser., v. 38, n. 2 [1988], 429); and, “... though the research is painstaking, the bibliography is not comprehensive, and the social and intellectual context is not familiar to most of the [modern] authors” (*ibid.*, 430).

²⁷ Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy*, 60–62, and elsewhere.

²⁸ The publication of Waithe’s *A History of Women Philosophers*, with its English translation of eight of the nine letters attributed to Pythagorean women (recalling that Waithe’s volume omits *Melissa to Kleareta*), stimulated further investigations of the Pythagorean women’s texts from scholars in the fields of philosophy, classics, history, and biblical studies. From then on, each needed to address the issue of the pseudonymity of the texts. If they were not pseudonymous, what could be learned about their real female authors? Or, if pseudonymous, were they written by women or men? And what are the consequences of the decisions? A feminist concern for women in history, like that behind Waithe’s work, aspires not only to restore women to the past, but of constructing a “usable past,” which would provide historical role models for women in the present, encouraging them to walk where their foremothers had trod. If the Pythagorean women’s letters were written by women, pseudonymously or not, they leave a modern woman holding a two-edged sword. On the one hand, the writings are indications that women have always “philosophized,” and therefore, modern feminist women may also think and work as philosophers. On the other hand, these Pythagorean texts are completely “feminized” (or “gendered”), dealing with female-specific topics, since they are based on a worldview where humankind is composed of two separate and distinct (and often, opposite) sexes. Further studies of the texts include: Nails, “The Pythagorean Women Philosophers: Ethics of the Household” (in *Ionian Philosophy*, ed. K.J. Boudouris [Athens: International Association for Greek Philosophy, 1989], 291–297); Ward, “Harmonia and Koinonia: Moral Values for Pythagorean Women” (in *Explorations in Feminist Ethics: Theory and Practice*; eds. Eve Browning Cole and Susan Coultrap-McQuin [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992], 57–68); P. Allen, *The Concept of Woman*, Vol. 1; and Plant, *Women Writers*. Hawley offered an important critique of Waithe’s theories in “The Problem of Women Philosophers in Ancient Greece”, 70–87).

In point of fact, all the available evidence speaks strongly in favor of these three female Pythagorean names—Theano, Myia, and Melissa—having substantial renown in the Greco-Roman world. Theano was famous as Pythagoras' virtuous wife and disciple, while Myia too (the daughter of Theano and Pythagoras) had been schooled in his philosophy. The name "Melissa" came to connote the height of female *sōphrosynē* in religious, philosophical, and household domains. Additionally, the general knowledge that the early Pythagorean communities included women²⁹ contributed to the "reasonable expectation" that some of these women could have written letters about women's moral behavior. As the following investigation of ancient sources shows, there is enough positive "fame" attached to all three women's names to explain the fabrication of pseudepigraphical letters.

THE PSEUDONYM "MELISSA"³⁰

In each of the extant manuscripts, the first word encountered in the letter *Melissa to Kleareta* is the sender's name in the nominative case. The appearance of this particular authorial pseudonym prepares the reader to interpret the epistolary contents.³¹ There are no titles for the work or further descriptions given of the author.³² There are no known female Pythagoreans named "Melissa," but the name carries strong positive associations in many ancient sources. The word μέλισσα, meaning "bee," and applied to either wild-bees or honey-bees,³³ is quite common. It is extended metaphorically to describe

²⁹ Evidence of this knowledge is detailed throughout the rest of this chapter.

³⁰ The name of the recipient here, Κλεαρέτα/Κλεαρέτη, is not known to be that of any Pythagorean woman, or of any other renowned historical figure. According to the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, it is found in only fourteen inscriptions: Κλεαρέτα occurs eight times, while Κλεαρέτη occurs six times (eds. P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews; 4 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996–2003]). I include both spellings, assuming that the *alpha*-ending is a Doric form; that the two forms are essentially the same is borne out by the fact that only one or the other appears in a geographical region, as attested in these citations. The name is derived from κλέος, meaning "fame," and ἀρετή, meaning, of course, "virtue." Thus, the recipient of Melissa's letter is "famous for her virtue," a highly appropriate name for a young woman who wants to acquire that kind of character. It is as if she will live up to her famous name as she continues to grow in virtue. My thanks to Prof. Helma Dik, Department of Classics, University of Chicago, for information and ideas about this name and that of the other recipient-names.

³¹ In *P.Haun.* II.13, the name is written in lowercase letters with no accent, with the final α uncertain due to a tear in the fragment.

³² Städele remarks: "Den Episteln der Melissa und Myia geht in den Hss. keine Themengabe voraus" (*Die Briefe*, 252, n. 3).

³³ The root μέλι- connotes honey or sweetness. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* notes that

prophetic inspiration (utterances often performed in an out-of-mind state)³⁴ and also used as a metaphor for poetry as a divinely-inspired activity.³⁵ Furthermore, bees were particularly associated with human women in mystical and religious contexts.³⁶ Priestesses of Apollo at Delphi, of Artemis, the Magna Mater, and Demeter were all called by the name Μέλισσα.³⁷ Städele links bees to women in the Neopythagorean theorizing about the

the Hebrew equivalent of “Melissa” is “Deborah,” which name is also applied to bees and to a “real” woman (3rd ed., rev., eds. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth [Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003], 953).

³⁴ Susan Scheinberg remarks: “The honey-induced prophetic frenzy of the bee maidens in the *Hymn to Hermes* ... belongs to a tradition in which divination depended upon the ritual drinking of a sacred, perhaps intoxicating liquid [often mead, made from honey], which opened the human psyche to messages from the divine world by bringing the god within the seer” (“The Bee Maidens of the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 83 [1979], 19).

³⁵ Scheinberg comes to a perceptive conclusion about allusions to honey and bees in these speech-activities: “Although the disciplines of poetry and prophecy, originally so closely bound together, drew apart from one another, their original proximity can be detected in literary tradition, after the fact, through a shared metaphor. Just as honey and bees are associated with oracles and prophets, so too honey and bees appear time and again in metaphors for poetry and poets” (ibid., 22). The label was also applied to the (female) Muses, e.g., “Young woman singing youthfully among the ones composing hymns, Sweet Erinna of the Muses who plucked flowers, Hades snatched up for a wedding-song” Παρθενικὴν νεαροῖδον ἐν ὑμνοπόλοισι μέλισσαν Ἥρινναν Μουσῶν ἄνθεα δρεπτομένην Ἀϊδᾶς εἰς ὑμέναιον ἀνάρπασεν, *Anthologia Palatina* 7.13; cited in LSJ, s.v. μέλισσα.

³⁶ A summary of sources may be found in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World* (eds. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider; English ed. Christine F. Salazar [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006], vol. 8). For more on bees in Greek religions, see G.W. Elderkin, “The Bee of Artemis,” *The American Journal of Philology* 60:2 (1939), 203–213.

³⁷ Elderkin remarks: “At Delphi there was a μέλισσα Δελφίς” (“Bee of Artemis,” 203; here citing Pindar, *Pyth.*, IV, 60). For data about bees and Delphi, see also Scheinberg, “The Bee Maidens,” 20–21. Elderkin notes: “The early association of the bee with the cult of Artemis that her priestesses received by varied evidence So important was the bee in the cult of Artemis that her priestesses received the name of Melissa, ‘Bee.’ ... Another such title was μελισσινόμος, ‘bee-keeper’ [for which Elderkin cites Aeschylus, frag. 84]” (“Bee of Artemis,” 203). In fact, Elderkin summons philological evidence to assert that “The name Ephesus [a center of Artemis-worship] thus meant ‘many bees’ or ‘place of many bees’” (ibid., 206). Roman statues of Artemis (or Cybele) found at Ephesus are adorned with bee figures on the sides of the skirt; see <http://www.ephesus.us/ephesus/ephesusmuseum.htm>.

References to the “bee” on the island of Crete include: “Melissa, the daughter of the Cretan king Melissos, [who] reared the new-born Zeus, the same Melissa who became the first priestess of the Magna Mater and bequeathed her title to her successors” (ibid., 204).

In *The Cave of the Nymphs*, his allegorical interpretation of an episode in the *Odyssey*, the Neo-Platonist Porphyry alludes to bee-priestesses: “And the ancients used to call the priestesses of Demeter ‘bees,’ who were initiates of the chthonic goddess, and Kore herself they used to call ‘Honey-like’” καὶ τὰς Δήμητρος ἱερείας ὡς τῆς χθονίας θεᾶς μύστιδας μελίσσας οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκάλουν αὐτὴν τε τὴν Κόρην Μελιτώδῃ, *De antro nymphaeum* 18.6–7.

transmigration of souls, citing Porphyry's analogy between bees and righteous human souls yearning to return to their γένεσις:

But still not only did they used to call all souls entering *genesis* 'bees,' but also those going to live with justice and to return again after performing acts dear to the gods. For the animal [i.e., the bee] is fond of returning and is especially just and sober; for which reason drink-offerings of honey are 'sober' ones Therefore, the honeycombs and the bees would be appropriate symbols common to both water-nymphs and souls being wedded to their *genesis*.³⁸

Porphyry's allegorizing has brought human souls and bees together in two ways: as those who desire to return to their *genesis*, and as those who are well-known for virtue.³⁹ Thus, being μέλιστα δίκαιον καὶ νηφαντικόν, *melissai* acquired a mystical connotation that was supported by their ethical behavior. Although *Melissa to Kleareta* is neither poetic nor prophetic in style, as in the earlier classical sources, a late antique reader might catch the allusion that its words are similarly sweet and "inspired."

Another aspect of bee behavior pertinent to the content of Melissa's letter is that bees were thought to model *sōphrosynē*. As Pomeroy states: "The bee was famous for purity and abstinence. Ancient entomologists did not understand the sexual reproduction of bees; therefore they associated this insect with chastity."⁴⁰ Aelian explicitly links the bee to *sōphrosynē* as well as to the Pythagorean way of life, which involved vegetarianism and simplicity in clothing and other material goods:

But a bee lives a pure life, and would never eat any living thing. It does not need Pythagoras as a counselor for any matter; it is enough for the flowers to be food for it. And it has the highest rank when it comes to *sōphrosynē*. At any rate, it hates luxury and delicacy. And the evidence is that it pursues the man

³⁸ οὐχ ἀπλῶς μέντοι πάσας ψυχὰς εἰς γένεσιν ἰούσας μελίσσας ἔλεγον, ἀλλὰ τὰς μελλούσας μετὰ δικαιοσύνης βιοτεύειν καὶ πάλιν ἀναστρέφειν εἰργασμένας τὰ θεοῖς φίλα. τὸ γὰρ ζῶον φιλόστροφον καὶ μέλιστα δίκαιον καὶ νηφαντικόν· ὅθεν καὶ νηφάλλιοι σπονδαὶ αἱ διὰ μέλιτος φέροιεν ἂν οὖν τὰ κηρία καὶ αἱ μέλισσαι οἰκεία σύμβολα καὶ κοινὰ ὑδριάδων νυμφῶν καὶ ψυχῶν εἰς γένεσιν νυμφευσμένων, *De ant. nymph.* 19.1–5, 8–10. Städele states "Neupythagoreische Philosophen bezeichnen so jede reine, keusche Seele (vgl. etwa Porphyr. antr.19) oder auch den jungfräulichen Mond (l.c. 18)" (*Die Briefe*, 253, n. 7). Malherbe appears to echo Städele's statement in his comments about the author of this letter: "Melissa was the name used by Neopythagoreans of chaste persons and beings, and its use in the letter written in her name ... may therefore be symbolic" (*Moral Exhortation*, 20).

³⁹ On the relationship of bees to death, Elderkin suggests that "The importance of the bee and honey in the cult of the dead likewise favor [sic] the conclusion that the beehive tomb owes its shape to the beehive, the abode of souls in the form of bees" ("Bee of Artemis," 213; citing again Porphyry, *de antro Nymph.* 19).

⁴⁰ *Xenophon "Oeconomicus,"* 279; citing here Pliny, *NH* 11.46, who notes that no one has ever observed the coitus of bees.

anointed with perfume and strikes as if it is an utter enemy. It knows the man that comes from licentious intercourse, and indeed pursues that man as its worst enemy.⁴¹

These elements of Aelian's depiction of the nature of bees are quite apt for interpreting *Melissa to Kleareta*: his evocation of Pythagorean practices, advocating *sôphrosynê* and proper adornment, decrying luxury and delicacy, and opposition to adultery, all match up with the worldview of Melissa's advice.⁴²

For ancient authors, the example of the bees was extremely useful for describing the dynamics of a well-run household.⁴³ The earliest extant text

⁴¹ βίον δὲ καθαρόν ζῆ μέλιττα, καὶ ζῶον οὐκ ἂν οὐδενὸς πάσαιτο ποτε· καὶ οὐ δεῖται Πυθαγόρου συμβούλου οὐδὲ ἓν, ἀπόχρη δὲ ἄρα σίτον αὐτῇ εἶναι τὰ ἄνθη. ἔστι δὲ καὶ σωφροσύνη ἀκροτάτη. χλιδὴν γοῦν καὶ θρύψιν μεμίσηκε. καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον, τὸν χρισάμενον μύρῳ διώκει τε καὶ ἐλαύνει ὡς πολέμιον ἀνήκεστα δράσαντα. οἶδε δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐλθόντα ἐξ ἀκολάστου ὁμιλίας, καὶ διώκει καὶ ἐκείνον οἷα δῆπου ἔχθιστον, NA 5.11.30–38. Aelian had previously mentioned the bee's avoidance of anointings, and likened it to the proper behavior of "*sôphrôn* young girls": "After all, the bees stay away from every bad smell and likewise from perfume, not enduring stench nor embracing the emasculation of perfume, such as, I suppose, refined and *sôphrôn* young girls are sickened by the former and despise the latter," Ἀπεχθάνονται δὲ ἄρα αἱ μέλιτται κακοσμία πάσῃ καὶ μύρῳ ὁμοίως, οὔτε τὸ δυσώδες ὑπομένουσιν οὔτε ἀσπαζόμεναι τῆς εὐωδίας τὸ τεθρυμμένον, οἷα δῆπου κόραι ἀστέϊαι τε καὶ σώφρονες τὸ μὲν βδελυττόμεναι τῆς δὲ ὑπερφρονούσαι, NA 1.58.

⁴² Since *Melissa to Kleareta* is dated prior to Aelian, it would be theoretically possible that he had access to the letter, but this does not seem to be the case.

⁴³ The beehive was also likened to political systems, as described by D. Allen ("Burning *The Fable of the Bees*: The Incendiary Authority of Nature," in *The Moral Authority of Nature*, eds. Lorraine Duston and Fernando Vidal [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004], 74–99). Allen writes: "Like the human world, the beehive has social organization; labor and value are divided and diversely apportioned. Indeed, Hesiod elsewhere uses the bee/drone dichotomy to poeticize the human division of labor along gender lines 'And as in covered hives, bees feed the drones, partners of evil works; all day long and until the sun goes down, daily the bees hasten, positioning the white honeycombs, while the drones who stay inside the sheltering of the beehives, reap the labor of others into their own bellies; and thus high-thundering Zeus caused women to be an evil for mortal men, partners of troublesome works'" (ibid., 74). Allen has partially modified the translation of Hesiod by Hugh G. Evelyn White, *Theogony*, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959 [1924]); see her 74, n. 2. The Greek text of the *Theogony*, 594–602 reads: ὥς δ' ὁπότ' ἐν σμῆνσσι κατηρεφέεσσι μέλισσαι κηφῆνας βόσκωσι, κακῶν ξυνήοντας ἔργων· αἱ μὲν τε πρόπαν ἡμᾶρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα ἡμάτιαι σπεύδουσι τιθεῖσιν τε κηρία λευκά, οἱ δ' ἔντοσθε μένοντες ἐπηρεφέας κατὰ σίμβλους ἀλλότριον κάματον σφετέρην ἐς γαστέρ' ἀμύνται· ὥς δ' αὐτῶς ἄνδρεςσι κακὸν θνητοῖσι γυναικᾶς Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης θῆκε, ξυνήοντας ἔργων ἀργαλέων. In *Works and Days*, the first created woman is, of course, Pandora. The fact that μέλισσα is a feminine noun, and κηφήν a masculine noun shows that linguistic gender does not necessarily correspond to the literal sex of an object, so that Hesiod can assign the opposite sexes to the kinds of bees; cf. also nn. 335, 336 for a discussion of the sexes of leader-bees, worker-bees and drones. Cf. also Virgil, *Georgics*, Book 4, for another comparison of beehive life to human society.

that compares the bee to a good woman in her household roles is that by Semonides (perhaps 7th c. BCE).⁴⁴ This iambic poem begins succinctly: “God made the mind of a woman separately from the first things” (χωρίς γυναικὸς θεὸς ἐποίησεν νόον τὰ πρῶτα, lines 1–2), and then describes ten different “kinds” of women created by God. The first nine are all negative portrayals of women;⁴⁵ each of these sorts of women has a corresponding vice that makes them unsuitable as wives.⁴⁶ Semonides finds only one natural entity that serves as positive material for creating a woman; his list thus culminates in the sort of woman made out of a bee:

And the woman from a bee: any man is lucky to get her,
 For on such a woman blame does not settle,
 But livelihood abounds on her account and increases,
 And she is a lover who grows old with the husband who loves her,
 Bearing noble and notable offspring.
 And she is very distinguished among all women
 And divine favor surrounds her.
 She does not delight in sitting among women
 Where they are making salacious comments.
 Such women Zeus gives to men
 As the best and most eloquent.⁴⁷

With the example of the bee, Semonides is able to display nearly all the most important characteristics of the *topos* of “good woman.”⁴⁸ She is a blame-

⁴⁴ From the edition (and commentary) of Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women* (Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes, 1975).

⁴⁵ The list includes: the sort of woman made out of the pig (τὴν μὲν ἐξ ὑός, lines 2–6); one of the fox (τὴν δ' ἐξ ... ἀλώπεκος, lines 7–11); one of the dog (τὴν δ' ἐκ κυνός, lines 12–20); others of earth (τὴν ... γῆϊνῃν, lines 21–26); of sea (τὴν δ' ἐκ θαλάσσης, lines 27–42); of the female-ass (τὴν δ' ἔκ ... ὄνου, lines 43–49); of the ferret (τὴν δ' ἐκ γαλῆς, lines 50–56); of the horse (τὴν δ' ἵππου, lines 57–70); and of the monkey (τὴν δ' ἐκ πιθήκου, lines 71–82).

⁴⁶ Many of these vices endured through the ages of Hellenic cultures, as seen in their similarities to those decried by Juvenal, Plutarch, and the author of the Pastorals.

⁴⁷ τὴν δ' ἐκ μελίσσης· τὴν τις εὐτυχεῖ λαβὼν // κείνηι γὰρ οἷη μῶμος οὐ προσιζάνει, // θάλλει δ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἀπαέζεται βίος, // φίλη δὲ σὺν φιλέοντι γηράσκει πόσει // τεκοῦσα καλὸν κώνομάκλυτον γένος. // ἀριπρεπὴς μὲν ἐν γυναιξὶ γίνεται // πάσηισι, θεῇ δ' ἀμφιδέδρομεν χάρις. // οὐδ' ἐν γυναιξὶν ἥδεται καθήμενῃ // δοκου λέγουσιν ἀφροδισίους λόγους. // τοίᾳς γυναικάς ἀνδράσιν χαρίζεται // Ζεὺς τὰς ἀρίστας καὶ πολυφραδεστάτας, lines 83–93; my translation from Lloyd-Jones' edition.

⁴⁸ What is missing is some reference to *sōphrosynē*. According to Helen North, after this tenth metaphor for a woman, Semonides “returns to his normal satiric strain and concludes the poem with a reminder that all other kinds of women constitute a source of woe for mankind, through the device of Zeus In his description of the bee-woman the poet does not apply the term *sōphron* to his paragon, although hers is precisely the kind of conduct for which the word was to be reserved in the classical period. But he does employ the related verb

less woman, who avoids other women's scandalous conversation. She is a companionable spouse, and raises "noble" (καλός) children. She causes βίος (which I have translated "livelihood" here) to abound and increase, which appears to be Semonides' general reference to a wife's capable management of the wealth and possessions of the household.⁴⁹ She is, quite simply, "the best" (τὰς ἀρίστας).

There was a difference of opinion in antiquity about the sex of the various types of bees, especially whether the largest leader-bee was male or female.⁵⁰ In his *Oeconomicus*, Xenophon follows the tradition that this head-bee is female, "the queen of the bees," ἡ τῶν μελιττῶν ἡγεμῶν (7.32).⁵¹ In the *Oeconomicus*, where Socrates questions Ischomachus about the administration of his large estate,⁵² Ischomachus discourses at some length with his

sophronein ... 'Whatever woman seems especially to be a good wife—*sophronein*—that very one happens to be doing the greatest harm, for while her husband is gaping, the neighbors rejoice to see how he is deceived'" ("The Mare, the Vixen, the Bee as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity" [*Illinois Classical Studies*, vol. II; ed. Miroslav Marcovich (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1977)], 36). Here North has translated lines 108–111 from Semonides: ἦτις δέ τοι μάλιστα σωφρονεῖν δοκεῖ, // αὕτη μέγιστα τυγχάνει λωβωμένη // κεχρημένος γὰρ ἀνδρός, οἱ δὲ γείτονες // χαίρουσ' ὀρώντες καὶ τόν, ὥς ἀμαρτάνει.

⁴⁹ As a counter-example, see Semonides' description of the pig-woman, living in the proverbial pig-sty: "everything in her house has been defiled with mud // she neglects in disorder and wallows on the ground // she is unbathed in unwashed clothing // growing fat while sitting on dunghills," τῇ πάντ' ἀν' οἶκον βορβόρῳ πεφυρμένα // ἄκοσμα κείται καὶ κυλινδρεται χαμαί // αὕτῃ δ' ἄλουτος ἀπλύτοις ἐν εἵμασιν // ἐν κοπρίῃσιν ἡμένη πιαίνεται, *Fr.* 7.3–6.

⁵⁰ Danielle Allen points out that in the seventh century BCE: "Hesiod wrote in an historical context where observers of insects were uncertain about the sex of the three kinds of bees in the hive: the single large bee that all the rest follow when the hive swarms; the tens of thousands of small 'worker bees' which fly back and forth between hive and flower; and the few hundred mid-size bees that leave the hive only rarely, and, in contrast to the other two types, have no sting" ("Burning the Fable," 95). According to Pomeroy, Aristotle "consistently refers to the leaders as male" (*Xenophon "Oeconomicus,"* 279). Similarly, Aelian speaks of the "king-bee," ὁ βασιλεύς, e.g., *NA* 1.60; 5.10, 11.

⁵¹ See also Xen, *Oec.* 7.17, 38. Furthermore, Xenophon has reversed Hesiod's gender assignment of all the bees: not only are the worker-bees (μελιτται) female, but the drones are male (οἱ κηφῆνες). In a later discussion about growing wheat, Xenophon alleges the drones are useless: "For what if," he said, 'brushy stuff, when it shoots up together with the wheat and seizes the nutrients of the wheat, strangles it, just as the drones who are useless seize the nourishment of the bees which those workers deposit?' Τί γάρ, ἔφη, ἀν ὕλη πνίγη συνεξορμῶσα τῷ σίτῳ καὶ διαρπάζουσα τοῦ σίτου τὴν τροφὴν ὥσπερ οἱ κηφῆνες διαρπάζουσιν ἄχρηστοι ὄντες τῶν μελιττῶν ἃ ἀν ἐκεῖναι ἐργασάμεναι τροφὴν καταθῶνται; *Oec.* 17.14. To his mind, the drone-bees, as in the *Theogony*, still serve no useful purpose in the hive, even though they are male rather than female.

⁵² Near the beginning of this part of the "dialogue" Socrates reports: "I said, 'O Ischomachus, I would gladly inquire of you, whether you yourself trained your wife so that she became like she ought, or if you received her after she had become well-versed by her father and

wide-eyed young wife about her role and function as household manager. He succinctly compares her household work to that of the queen-bee of a hive. When his wife asks “And what works does the queen of the bees have that are similar to ones which I must do?”⁵³ Ischomachus answers:

I said, “Because that queen-bee who remains in the hive does not permit the bees to be idle, but she sends out for whichever ones need to work outside to their work, and whatever each of them brings in she knows and takes, and she saves these things which might be necessary to be used. And when the hour comes for their use, she distributes a just portion to each. And she supervises the finishing-weaving for the honeycombs inside, so that they are woven beautifully and quickly, and she cares for the progeny that are born so that they are brought up from childhood. And when the young have been reared and become capable of work, she sends them away from home with a leader of the offspring.”⁵⁴

In this explanation of the wife’s household responsibilities, Ischomachus has concentrated on the queen-bee’s work with regard to the slaves (drones *and* worker-bees) and to the provisions, with a brief reference to childrearing, all of which are considered as an embodiment of wifely *sōphrosynē*.

Given the strong associations made between the nature, work, and virtue of the human woman and the nature, work, and virtue of bees, the name “Melissa” carries a significant authority which does not necessarily derive from a link to any historical woman by that name. The literary, religious, and natural history backgrounds indicate that the pseudonym “Melissa” was not simply chosen at random, but was intentionally chosen to complement the author’s advice. It encapsulates the idea that the purported author is the “queen-bee” of good wives, giving advice as well as modeling proper conduct to the younger wives who aspire to her position.

mother as to how to manage her household duties?” ἔφην, ἔγωγε, ὦ Ἰσχόμαχε, πάνυ ἂν ἡδέως σου πυθοίμην, πότερα αὐτὸς σὺ ἐπαίδευσας τὴν γυναῖκα ὥστε εἶναι οἷαν δεῖ ἢ ἐπισταμένην ἑλαβες παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῆς μητρὸς διοικεῖν τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτῇ, *Oec.* 7.4.

⁵³ Καὶ ποῖα δὴ, ἔφη ἐκείνη, ἔργα ἔχουσα ἢ τῶν μελιττῶν ἡγεμῶν ἐξομοιοῦται τοῖς ἔργοις οἷς ἐμε δεῖ πράττειν; *Oec.* 7.32. Pomeroy offers more discussion of this portion (*Plutarch's "Advice,"* 276–280, 283).

⁵⁴ Ὅτι, ἔφην ἐγώ, ἐκείνη γε ἐν τῷ σμήνῃ μένουσα οὐκ ἔῃ ἀργοὺς τὰς μελίττας εἶναι, ἀλλ’ ὅς μὲν δεῖ ἔξω ἐργάζεσθαι ἐκπέμπει ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον, καὶ ἃ ἂν αὐτῶν ἐκάστη εἰσφέρει οἷδ’ ἐτε καὶ δέχεται, καὶ σώζει ταῦτα ἔστ’ ἂν δέῃ χρῆσθαι. ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἡ ὥρα τοῦ χρῆσθαι ἦκη, διανέμει τὸ δίκαιον ἐκάστη. καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔνδον δ’ ἐξυφαινομένοις κηρίοις ἐφέστηκεν, ὥς καλῶς καὶ ταχέως ὑφαίνηται, καὶ τοῦ γιγνομένου τόκου ἐπιμελεῖται ὥς ἐκτρέφεται· ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐκτραφῇ καὶ ἀξιοεργοὶ οἱ νεοττοὶ γένωνται, ἀποικίζει αὐτοὺς σὺν τῶν ἐπιγόνων τινὶ ἡγεμόνι, *Oec.* 7.33–34.

THE PSEUDONYM “MYIA”⁵⁵

The Renaissance manuscripts of *Myia to Phyllis* begin with the sender's name in the nominative case: Μυῖα. As with *Melissa to Kleareta*, there are no titles for the work or further descriptions given of the author. Whatever authority might accrue to Myia's letter comes by two means: information known about Myia from other ancient sources and its placement in the small collection *MM* and the subsequent composite collections.

Like Theano, Myia was known as a member of Pythagoras' household. The earliest attestation to her is found in the doxographical *Anonymus Photii* from the third-second centuries BCE. There Myia is mentioned briefly along with her three siblings: “So Pythagoras is said to have lived for a hundred and four years. And Mnesarchos, one of his sons, is said to have died younger, and Telauges the other one succeeded (him), and Aisara and Myia were his daughters.”⁵⁶ Later, Myia's name is also linked with Theano by Clement of Alexandria, who mentions both women in his list of Greek philosophical women who were *sōphrōn*:⁵⁷

⁵⁵ The named recipient of this letter, Φυλλίς, meaning “foliage,” is found sixteen times in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Six of these occurrences are in Latin inscriptions, which may hint at its popularity as a “chic” Greek name for Roman girls; this suggestion was made by Prof. Helma Dik, University of Chicago, in email correspondence with me. This name is derived from the word φύλλον, for “leaf,” and it does not appear to have as much positive metaphorical meaning attached to it as does Κλεαρέτα. The most famous “Phyllis” is the mythological daughter of King Sithon of Thrace, who was engaged to Demophon, son of Theseus. When Demophon did not return by the time appointed for their marriage, she hanged herself. Thereupon, she was either turned into a leafless almond tree that put forth leaves when Demophon belatedly arrived, or else the trees around her grave dropped all their leaves. (The story is found in Ps.-Apollodorus, *Epitome* 617; Ovid, *Heroides* II.226–244; and Hyginus, *Fables*, 243. These sources are cited by Elise P. Garrison, “Suicidal Females in Greek and Roman Mythology: A Catalogue,” found on the website: Διοτίμα, at www.stoa.org/diotima/essays/garrison_catalogue.shtml.) One Phyllis, a musician, is mentioned in passing in the *Suda* (“Phi,” 836). Otherwise there are no particular literary or historical connections to be made to this name, and no allusions in the letter itself.

⁵⁶ ὅτι ἑκάτὸν καὶ τεσσάρων λέγεται ἐτῶν ἐζηκέναι τὸν Πυθαγόραν. καὶ ὁ μὲν Μνήσαρχος, εἰς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, λέγεται νεώτερος τελευτήσαι, Τηλαύγης δὲ ὁ ἕτερος διεδέξατο. Καὶ Αἰσάρα καὶ Μυῖα αἱ θυγατέρες, *Anon. Phot.* 237.16 (Thesleff's edition).

⁵⁷ This is not surprising given Clement's own education in philosophy and his application of “the writings of poets and philosophers constructively to build his case for Christianity” (W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984], 369). Frend summarizes: “Early in the *Miscellanies*, [Clement] admits that there were coincidences between Christian truth and the beliefs of Greek philosophers. Even if these hit on the truth accidentally, this suggested that God had revealed himself to them also” (*ibid.*, 370). Städele refers to “die

Yes indeed, Themisto, the daughter of Zoilus (she was from Lampsacus), the wife of Leontes of Lampsacus, taught the Epicurean philosophical teachings, just as Myia, the daughter of Theano, [taught] the Pythagorean teachings, and Arignote who wrote down lore about Dionysus.⁵⁸

Porphry, too, connects Myia with the family of Pythagoras in his *Vita Pythagorae* from the late third century CE:⁵⁹

But others record as the offspring of Theano, daughter of Pythonax of the Cretan race: Telauges, son of Pythagoras, and daughter Myia, but others also Arignote; whose Pythagorean writings also are preserved. Timaeus recounts that the daughter of Pythagoras, as a young woman [παρθένος] also led the young women in Croton, and that his wife [led] the wives.⁶⁰

Here Myia is the daughter of Theano and Pythagoras, and sister of Telauges (and Arignote?). This account states that one of these persons—Myia and/or Telauges and/or Arignote—authored some Pythagorean texts. Städele notes this possibility: “Porphyr. *Vita Pyth.* 4 läßt sie unter Berufung auf verschiedene andere Quellen eine Tochter des Pythagoras und der Theano und damit eine Schwester des Telauges sein; sie soll sogar Schriften hinterlassen haben.”⁶¹ Porphry also uses Timaeus’ report of Myia’s “leader-

Hochschätzung, die eine Heidin wie Theano in der patrischen Literatur genoß” (*Die Briefe*, 332).

⁵⁸ ναι μὴν καὶ Θεμιστῶ ἡ Ζωΐλου ἡ Λαμψακηνή ἡ Λεοντέως γυνὴ τοῦ Λαμψακηνοῦ τὰ Ἐπικούρεια ἐφιλοσόφει καθάπερ Μυία ἡ Θεανοῦς θυγάτηρ τὰ Πυθαγόρεια καὶ Ἀριγνώτη ἡ τὰ περὶ Διονύσου γραψαμένη, *Strom.* 4.19.121. After these three illustrious women, Clement mentions “the daughters of Diodorus, who was called Kronos, who all became dialecticians” (αἱ γὰρ Διοδώρου τοῦ Κρόνου ἐπικληθέντος θυγατέρες πάσαι διαλεκτικαὶ γεγόνασιν, *Strom.* 4.19.121). Following these he cites Hipparchia the Cynic, Arete (whose father Aristippus wrote a letter to her), Lastheneia of Arcis, Axiothea of Phlius, and Aspasia of Miletus. I discuss this reference from Clement further in the section on “Theano” below. Another Myia appears in the next section of the *Stromateis*, 4.19.122, but this is evidently a different Myia, for this woman is listed with other poets: “On account of the length of this discourse, recounting neither the [female] poets Corinna and Telesilla, Myia and Sappho,” διὰ τὸ μῆκος τοῦ λόγου, μήτε τὰς ποιητρίδας καταλέγων, Κόρινναν καὶ Τελέσιλλαν Μυίαν τε καὶ Σαπφῶ, *Strom.* 4.19.122. See the discussion of Lucian’s encomium on Myia below for reference to the poet Myia.

⁵⁹ Thesleff states: “To the Neoplatonic tradition from Porphyry onwards the Corpus [of Doric Pseudopythagorean texts] seems to have been well known. Above all Iamblichus was concerned with the writings” (*Introduction*, 120).

⁶⁰ ἄλλοι δ’ ἐκ Θεανοῦς τῆς Πυθώνιακος τὸ γένος Κρήσης υἱὸν Τηλαύγῃ Πυθαγόρου ἀναγράφουσι καὶ θυγατέρα Μυίαν, οἱ δὲ καὶ Ἀριγνώτην· ὧν καὶ συγγράμματα Πυθαγόρεια σώζεσθαι. Τίμαιος δ’ ἰστορεῖ τὴν Πυθαγόρου θυγατέρα καὶ παρθένον οἶσαν ἡγεῖσθαι τῶν παρθένων ἐν Κρότωνι καὶ γυναῖκα τῶν γυναικῶν, *Vita Pyth.* 4. This description, which focuses mostly on Theano, is quite similar to that of the *Suda*, *Theta* 84; see the evidence on Theano below.

⁶¹ *Die Briefe*, 267.

ship” role with the young women (or virgins) in Croton. This is not only a memory of how important Pythagoras’ family members were to the handing over of his tradition: when it is paralleled with the assertion that Pythagoras’ wife “led” the wives of Croton, we have another indication of sex-segregation in philosophical education: women teach women (and usually, not men), while men teach men (and sometimes, women).⁶²

That Myia was a member of Pythagoras’ family is reiterated in the tenth-century CE encyclopedic *Suda*, which preserves the name in several places. There are three separate entries for the name Myia:

1361—Myia, inspired lyric poet, sweetly harmonizing on the lyre.⁶³

1362—Myia, a Spartan, poet. Hymns for Apollo and Artemis.⁶⁴

1363—Myia, daughter of Pythagoras the great and Theano, a Samian.⁶⁵

She is also mentioned in the entries about her parents: “Theano, Cretan woman, philosopher, daughter of Pythonax, and wife of the great Pythagoras, from whom she had Telauges and Mnesarchos, Myia and Arignote,”⁶⁶ and under “Pythagoras”: “According to some [he had] also a daughter Myia by name, according to others also Arignote.”⁶⁷ From all these instances, the conclusion emerges that “... [Myia] gehört der Überlieferung zufolge zum engsten Kreis um Pythagoras.”⁶⁸

Two other ancient references to a certain Myia state that she is Pythagorean, but do not connect her to the family of Pythagoras. Iamblichus includes a Myia in the list of “most famous Pythagorean women,” naming her “the wife of Milon of Croton,”⁶⁹ thus establishing in another way the Pythagorean pedigree of this name by “marrying” her to a famous Pythagorean.

⁶² For instance, Theano is called Pythagoras’ “disciple,” and Pythagoras teaches in his “speech to the women of Croton.” Theano is one Pythagorean woman whose philosophical writings do not handle only “women’s issues,” as I discuss later in this chapter.

⁶³ Μυῖα, Θεσπιακή, λυρική. μέλη πρὸς λύραν ἀρμόζοντα. See the discussion of Lucian’s encomium below.

⁶⁴ Μυῖα, Σπαρτιάτις, ποιήτρια. ὕμνους εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἀρτεμιν.

⁶⁵ Μυῖα, Πυθαγόρου τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Θεανούς, Σαμία.

⁶⁶ Θεανῶ, Κρήσσα, φιλόσοφος, θυγάτηρ μὲν Πυθώνακτος, γαμετὴ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου Πυθαγόρου, ἐξ οὗ ἔσχε Τηλαύγην καὶ Μνήσαρχον καὶ Μυῖαν καὶ Ἀριγνώτην, *Theta*, 84.

⁶⁷ κατὰ δὲ τινὰς καὶ θυγάτηρ, Μυῖα ὄνομα, κατὰ δὲ ἄλλους καὶ Ἀριγνώτη, *Pi*, 3120.

⁶⁸ Städele, *Die Briefe*, 267. The *Anon. Phot.* have Myia as daughter of Pythagoras, sister of Telauges, Mnesarchos, and Aisara. Porphyry places her as daughter of Pythagoras and Theano, sister of Telauges and maybe Arignote. Similarly, the *Suda* lists her family members as Theano, Pythagoras, Telauges, Mnesarchos and Arignote.

⁶⁹ Μυῖα γυνὴ Μίλωνος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, *De Vita Pythagorica*, 267. See below for Iamblichus’ full list of Pythagorean women.

The name Μυῖα is also the Greek word for “fly.” The satirist Lucian of Samosata has written an “encomium” about this creature that eventually mentions a Pythagorean Myia. After reviewing some positive characteristics of the insect,⁷⁰ Lucian moves on to famous women who were named “Myia”:

According to the ancients, there was also a certain woman with the same name as the fly, a poet, altogether good and wise,⁷¹ and another woman, a famous *hetaira* in Attika, about whom the comic poet says, “Myia bit him as far as his heart”; thus the comic charm neither disowned nor excluded the name of “the fly” from the stage, nor were parents ashamed to call their daughters thus. As for tragedy, it also has remembered the fly with great praise, as in these words: “It is strange that the fly by brave strength // jumps on human bodies, as if full of murder // yet armed men fear the spear of war.” Many things I could also say about Myia the Pythagorean were not the story of her so well-known to everyone.⁷²

According to Lucian, not only are there often-unrecognized strengths (“virtues”) in the small fly (e.g., its intelligence, its vicious bites, its ability to harass larger beings), but also famous women are named for it and ordinary parents give the name to their daughters. The comment about Myia the Pythagorean, which seems almost a throw-away line, serves as the last and therefore the culmination of Lucian’s examples of women named Myia.⁷³ In spite of his satirical bent, Lucian’s general assumption is that women who bear the name of “Myia” are thought to exhibit some of the positive characteristics of the fly, which appear to be bravery, loving-kindness, and intelli-

⁷⁰ These admirable qualities are many; a fly possesses: the colors of a peacock (*Mus. Enc.* 1); a melodious-sounding flight (*Mus. Enc.* 2); great intelligence in eluding spiders (*Mus. Enc.* 5); a strong bite (*Mus. Enc.* 6); and even an immortal soul, based on the observation that “when ashes are sprinkled on a dead fly, she revives and has a second birth and a new life from the beginning,” ἀποθανοῦσα γὰρ μυῖα τέφρας ἐπιχυθείσης ἀνίσταται καὶ παλιγγενεσία τις αὐτῇ καὶ βίος ἄλλος ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς γίνεται, *Mus. Enc.* 7.

⁷¹ Probably one Myia referred to in the *Suda*, “Mu” 1361 or 1362.

⁷² Ἐγένετο κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς καὶ γυνή τις ὁμώνυμος αὐτῇ, ποιήτρια, πάνυ καλὴ καὶ σοφὴ, καὶ ἄλλη ἑταῖρα τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἐπιφανής, περὶ ἧς καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς ποιητὴς ἔφη, ἡ Μυῖα ἔδακνεν αὐτὸν ἄχρι τῆς καρδίας· οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ κωμικὴ χάρις ἀπηξίωσεν οὐδὲ ἀπέκλεισε τῆς σκηνῆς τὸ τῆς μυῖας ὄνομα, οὐδ’ οἱ γονεῖς ἡδοῦντο τὰς θυγατέρας οὕτω καλοῦντες. ἡ μὲν γὰρ τραγωδία καὶ σὺν μεγάλῳ ἐπαίνῳ μέμνηται τῆς μυῖας, ὥς ἐν τούτοις, δεινὸν γε τὴν μὲν μυῖαν ἀλκίμῳ σθένει // πηδᾶν ἐπ’ ἀνδρῶν σώμαθι, ὥς πλησθῆι φόνου, // ἄνδρα δ’ ὀπλίτας πολέμιον ταρβεῖν δόρυ. πολλὰ δ’ ἂν εἶχον εἰπεῖν καὶ περὶ Μυῖας τῆς Πυθαγορικῆς, εἰ μὴ γνώριμος ἦν ἅπασιν ἡ κατ’ αὐτὴν ἱστορία, *Mus. Enc.* 11.

⁷³ After this sentence he digresses to final brief entomological remarks about another kind of fly, ending with a touch of humor about the length of the speech: “Although I still have many things to say, I will stop the speech, lest I seem, as the proverb has it, to make an elephant from a fly,” πολλὰ δ’ ἔτι ἔχων εἰπεῖν καταπαύσω τὸν λόγον, μὴ καὶ δόξω κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἐλέφαντα ἐκ μυῖας ποιεῖν, *Mus. Enc.* 12.

gence. In addition, that a fly is small yet powerful may also correspond to the social perception of human women as smaller and seemingly less powerful than men. Lucian does not specify how any of these traits connect to the story of Myia the Pythagorean, but it is legitimate to conclude that the person and character of Myia the philosopher measure up to the good qualities thought to be exemplified in the behavior of flies.⁷⁴ Furthermore, while it may only be felicitous that the first two pseudonyms in this letter collection are both the names of insects, the doubled link between the names of virtuous women and virtuous insects provides another means of engaging the reader's attention and reflection.⁷⁵

These extant sources show that a certain woman named "Myia" was well-known as a Pythagorean and often said to be the daughter of Pythagoras. In Clement's *Stromateis*, Porphyry's *Vita Pythagorae*, and the *Suda*, she is connected to Theano, her famous mother and the wife of Pythagoras, while the *Anonymus Photii*, Porphyry and the *Suda* also note her siblings, Iamblichus has listed her among the famous Pythagorean women. Although there are no stories recounted about her and no apophthegms attributed to her, there is the slight suggestion in Porphyry's *Vitae Pythagorae* that she was an author of Pythagorean texts. Certainly, the name Myia carries no negative connotations; in fact, Lucian's encomium attaches to her the many fine qualities of the fly, whose name she bears: intelligence, strength, bravery, and love for humanity. This puts a new face on the brief citation in Porphyry's *VP* that as a young woman she was "leading" the young women of Croton. This evidence shows that "Myia" was a well-known Pythagorean name from the past and suggests that a letter written under that name would have accrued substantial authority from the author's name alone. It might have been especially appropriate for such a woman to author the letter written to Phyllis on a subject of concern to many younger women: the care of an infant.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Städele laments: "Für uns bleibt sie dennoch nicht viel mehr als ein Name, da die erwähnte Geschichte nicht überliefert wurde und da die antiken Traditionen über sie auseinanderlaufen ..." (*Die Briefe*, 267). However, Lucian's assumption that "everyone knows" still points to the eminence of this woman by the second century CE.

⁷⁵ I have been unable to locate any ancient source that connects the two insects. Additionally, in Aesop's tales, neither is portrayed in a positive way (bees are the subject of *Fab.* 74 and 172; flies of *Fab.* 82 and 177).

⁷⁶ Porphyry's account calls Myia a *παρθένης*, so the reader would need to assume that she eventually was married (according to Iamblichus, to the Pythagorean Milon of Croton) and had children herself.

THE PSEUDONYM "THEANO"

The name "Theano" appears as the sender of each of the three letters in the smaller letter-collection (*TH₃*).⁷⁷ In the codices, we find the nominative Θεανώ, with no further description.⁷⁸ The letter *Theano to Euboule* in *P.Haun.* II.13 also begins with this form of her name but, of course, without the accented *omega*. The woman Theano was much revered in antiquity: more texts, maxims and anecdotes are ascribed to her than to any other Pythagorean woman (or any other female philosopher).⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Once again the named recipients in this collection are not known as Pythagorean women. Städele notes that "Eubule, Nikostrate, Kallisto sind griechische Allerweltsname" (*Die Briefe*, 290, n. 10). However, as Städele continues: "Bei den Adressatinnen handelt es sich also um keine bekannten oder 'typischen' Pythagoreerinnen" (*ibid.*, 290, n. 10).

Εὐβουλή/Εὐβούλα appears in the *Lexicon* thirty-one times, seventeen times with the *alpha*-ending and fourteen times with the *eta*-ending. This name means literally, "good counsel," or "well-advised", and is an apt name for a person in her position, who in the construction of this letter, is on the receiving end of "good advice" from the famed Theano.

Νικοστράτη is about as popular as Θεανώ in the extant sources, being found forty-nine times, the bulk of these from Athens. The name is a compound of "victorious" and "warrior," a feminine counterpart to the even more common Νικόστρατος. The name Nikostrate alerts the reader to the letter's theme of her struggle for self-control.

Of all the recipient's names being considered, Καλλιστώ is the most commonly occurring name in the *Lexicon*, appearing seventy-five times, three-fifths of these in the regions of Attica. (Kallisto also appears in Greek mythology; she was a nymph loved by Zeus, changed into a she-bear by Hera.) From its meaning of "most beautiful" or "best," the addressee receives high praise from those who name her, and she must aspire to the high promise of such a name in her character and living, or, in the specific situation of this letter, as a young woman newly supervising female slaves.

⁷⁸ As noted above, the medieval manuscripts have additional titles for the letters based on their subject-matter. While these later titles are interesting for their characterization of the letters in question, all the evidence shows that Theano was originally presented as the named author with no further references to her origins, abilities, or fame.

⁷⁹ Many of the ancient references to a Pythagorean "Theano" are found in Thesleff's second volume on the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha (*Pythagorean Texts*, 193–201). In addition to assembling some historical-biographical attestations to Theano, Thesleff includes the following texts attributed to Theano: eight letters, four titles, a dedication, five lines of a text on piety, references to two otherwise unknown poems, and a short quote on immortality found in Clement (*Strom.* 4.44.2). Thesleff also lists sources of "numerous" apophthegms ascribed to Theano (*Pythagorean Texts*, 194). Cf. also his statement there about the apophthegms: "Theano, as an ideal wife and mother, grew very popular later" (*ibid.*). Of these, Thesleff earlier stated: "There also existed at least one edition of γνῶμαι attributed to Pythagoras. The collections of apophthegms are of even remoter interest here. Theano was a popular character in such legends, and she is also said to have collected Pythagorean apophthegms herself" (*Introduction*, 119). One must remember that Thesleff has not listed any of his sources

The earliest reference to Theano (third century BCE) is found in a poem by Hermesianax about famous men who fell in love with women: "Such was the love for Theano, which bound up Pythagoras of Samos. Yet, he had discovered the niceties of the spirals in geometry and the circuit enveloped by the aether in the sphere of the earth, and he had completely renounced the world."⁸⁰ This description of the two lovers sets up a dichotomy between the philosophical life, represented here by Pythagoras' knowledge of geometry and astronomy as well as his wordly renunciation, and his "captivation" by the love of a woman. As Richard Hawley points out, "... the poem as a whole is devoted to learned men who nonetheless fall victim to love Theano is but one image of sensuality. It would spoil the picture if ... Hermesianax were to depict Theano as a philosopher herself."⁸¹ On the other hand, the

in chronological order and with no regard for text transmission history. For attestations to Theano in Syriac sources, see below.

An essay by Blase Nagy analyzes another "Theano," "the only priestess in the *Iliad*, or for that matter, in the *Odyssey*" ("The Naming of Athenian Girls: A Case in Point," *Classical Journal*: 74 [1979]: 360–364). He argues that this woman "takes on a special significance as the lone priestess of the Homeric epics, the vehicles of panhellenic *paideia*" (ibid., 360). Nagy finds eleven attestations of the name in Athenian inscriptions from the fifth century BCE to the second century CE, five of which he believes describe women who were priestesses (ibid., 361–362). His conclusion is "that Athenian parents considered Theano as a suitable name for girls who at least had the potential of assuming a religious position [These parents may] have thought it appropriate or even lucky to name their daughters after a literary model, that is, Theano, the only priestess in Homer" (ibid., 363–364). Nowhere does Nagy mention Theano, the wife of Pythagoras, or any other philosophical Theano, yet he was cited by Pomeroy as evidence for a claim related to the Pythagorean Theano: "[since] the names of children often reflected (and still do) their parents' religious persuasions or intellectual interests by naming their offspring after earlier Pythagoreans, the Neopythagoreans strengthened their bonds with their spiritual forebears" (*Women in Hellenistic Egypt* [1984], 64, n. 125). Pomeroy's citation initiated some references to Nagy's article that also ignored the fact that he was speaking of a *priestess* named "Theano." Waithe and Harper followed with the statement that "The name 'Theano' was a popular name in antiquity" (*A History of Women Philosophers*, 41, citing Nagy on 57 n. 1). The article is also cited by Ward, who states that "it was customary to name children after famous persons of the school" ("Harmonia and Koinonia," 68 n. 26). Plant also cites Nagy's essay, but he at least understands that the "Theano" in question is not Pythagoras' wife: "Theano was not an uncommon name (there is a Theano in Homer)" (*Women Writers*, 68; also, 74 n. 6).

⁸⁰ Οἷ μὲν Σάμιον μανίη κατέδησε Θεανούς // Πυθαγόρην, ἐλίκων κομψὰ γεωμετρίας // εὐρόμενον, καὶ κύκλον ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθήρ // αἷης ἐν σφαίρῃ, πάντ' ἀποτασσάμενον, *El., Frag.* 7. The Greek text and English translation are taken from P. Kobiliri, *A Stylistic Commentary on Hermesianax* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1998). The last extant section of this poem by Hermesianax refers to three philosophers—Pythagoras, Socrates, and Aristippus—who, although they had "set for themselves an austere mode of life ... were [not even] able to avert the terrible confusion caused by love, but they submitted themselves to the cruel yoke of love, when it manifested itself" (ibid., 19).

⁸¹ "Problem of Women Philosophers," 78.

poem clearly plays upon the well-known fact that this enchanting Theano had an intimate relationship with Pythagoras.

Theano is also mentioned in the *Anonymus Photii*, already cited in the discussion of the name Myia: “And Theano is said to be not only his disciple but also one of his daughters.”⁸² This indicates some confusion about Theano’s exact relationship to Pythagoras. In both possibilities, however, she is a member of Pythagoras’ family.

If the work of Aelius Theon can be reliably dated to the second half of the first century CE, then a χρεία about Theano was widely circulating at that time.⁸³ This particular chreia serves as Theon’s example of a “that kind [of chreia] with an inquiry”:⁸⁴

Theano the Pythagorean philosopher, when asked by someone how many days a woman [must] be apart from man to go in purity to the Thesmophorion, said, ‘From her own immediately, but from another, never.’⁸⁵

The anecdote has survived in so many varied sources that Hock and O’Neal are able to make comparisons among them and conclude that:

This chreia, despite its popularity within the rhetorical tradition and without, varies little in its recitation The question sometimes refers to the temple (τὸ Θεσμοφορεῖον in Theon), sometimes to the festival (τὰ Θεσμοφóρια in Nic[olaus], Dox[apatres], Planud[es], and Darm[stadt Fragment]), and sometimes to no special place or occasion (in Diogenes Laertius, Stobaeus, and *Gnom. Par.*).⁸⁶

By means of the chreia, Theano is portrayed as a Pythagorean, a philosopher, and (perhaps in consequence of her moral training) a woman of great virtue.

In the late first century CE, Plutarch explicates another chreia about Theano, found, fittingly enough, in his *Advice to Bride and Groom*:

⁸² καὶ ἡ Θεανὼ δὲ λέγεται οὐ μαθήτρια μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μία τῶν θυγατέρων αὐτοῦ εἶναι, 438b. This source is included in Thesleff, *Pythagorean Texts*, 194.

⁸³ I adopt the definition of χρεία from Hock and O’Neil: “a saying or action that is expressed concisely, attributed to a character, and regarded as useful for living” (*The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Vol. 1, The “Progymnasmata”* [trans. and ed. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O’Neil; SBLTT 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986], 26). Regarding the dating and identity of Theon, Hock and O’Neil state the scholarly consensus that Theon was the Stoic contemporary of Quintilian in the first century CE, but note that this has not been confirmed (ibid., 63–64).

⁸⁴ Ἡ δὲ πρυσματικὴ τοιαύτη, *Prog.* 61.

⁸⁵ Θεανὼν ἡ Πυθαγορικὴ φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τίνος ποσताία γυνὴ ἀπ’ ἀνδρὸς καθαρὰ εἰς τὸ θεσμοφορεῖον κάτεισιν εἶπεν ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου παραχρημα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδέποτε, *Prog.* 62–66.

⁸⁶ *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol. 1, 341. See below for additional citations of this chreia, including Clement, *Strom.* 4.19; Iamblichus, *VP* 132; and Theodoret, *De Car.* 12.73.

Theano showed her arm when she put on herself her outer garment. But when someone said, “Your forearm is beautiful,” she said, “But it does not belong to the public.” It is necessary not only for the forearm but also for the speech of a *sōphrōn* woman not to belong to the public, and for her to be modest in her voice and keep it guarded in the presence of outsiders, as both [forearm and voice] render her naked. For her emotion and character and disposition are seen in it when she speaks.⁸⁷

Here Plutarch lifts up Theano to his female student Eurydike⁸⁸ as a case study of the *sōphrōn* woman, applying the situation of the exposure of her body to the appropriate speech (λόγος), and also to the “emotion and character and disposition” (πάθος καὶ ἥθος καὶ διάθεσις) of the virtuous woman.⁸⁹ A woman’s verbal self-suppression is thus equated with her bodily concealment, and both types of modesty “reveal” her excellent interior moral character.

At the end of this text, Plutarch mentions Theano again as the first in a list of “admirable and famous women” who adorned themselves with the fruit of philosophical training:

But you, O Eurydike, try especially to be familiar with the sayings of wise and good people and always to have in your mouth those statements you received from us when you were a girl, so that you will gladden your husband, and be admired by the other women, thus being sumptuously and solemnly adorned without price. For there is no way to acquire or to put on this rich woman’s pearls and this foreign woman’s silk robes except at high price, but as for the adornments of Theano and Cleoboulina, and Gorgos the wife of Leonidos, and Timoclea the sister of Theagenes, and Claudia of old, and Cornelia the wife of Scipio and as many other women who were admirable and famous, it is possible when clothed and adorned with them for free to live at the same time honorably and blessedly.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Ἡ Θεανὼ παρέφηνε τὴν χεῖρα περιβαλλομένη τὸ ἱμάτιον. εἰπόντος δὲ τινος καλὸς ὁ πῆχυς, ἀλλ’ οὐ δημόσιος, ἔφη. δεῖ δὲ μὴ μόνον τὸν πῆχυν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν λόγον δημόσιον εἶναι τῆς σώφρονος, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν ὡς ἀπογύμνωσιν αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ φυλάττεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτός· ἐνορᾶται γὰρ αὐτῇ καὶ πάθος καὶ ἥθος καὶ διάθεσις λαλούσης, *Advice, Mor.* 142C–D (31). This story is also excerpted from Plutarch by Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.49a (W.-H. 585).

⁸⁸ It is interesting that a letter of Theano to a certain Eurydike is found among the four letters in the manuscript *Vat. Gr.* 578. Does this signal that Plutarch’s female student also had become known as a virtuous female philosopher?

⁸⁹ Here Plutarch brings together Aristotle’s three rhetorical proofs, λόγος, πάθος, and ἥθος (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.3–6; cf. 3.7.6–7).

⁹⁰ Σὺ δ’ ὦ Εὐρυδική, μάλιστα πειρώ τοῖς τῶν σοφῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν ὁμιλεῖν καὶ διὰ στόματος αἰετὰς φωνὰς ἔχειν ἐκεῖνας ὧν καὶ παρθένος οὖσα παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀνελάμβανες, ὅπως εὐφραίνῃς μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα, θαυμάζῃ δ’ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν, οὕτω κοσμουμένη περιττῶς καὶ σεμνῶς ἀπὸ μηδενός. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ τῆσδε τῆς πλουσίας μαργαρίτας καὶ τὰ τῆσδε τῆς ξένης σηρικὰ λαβεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ περθεῖσθαι μὴ πολλοῦ πριαμένην, τὰ δὲ Θεανοῦς κόσμια καὶ Κλεοβουλίνης καὶ Γοργοῦς τῆς Λεωνίδου γυναικὸς καὶ Τιμοκλείας τῆς Θεαγένους ἀδελφῆς καὶ Κλαυδίας τῆς

In both these excerpts, Theano (with other women in the second instance) is esteemed as a good woman, especially for how her modest bodily concealment and adornment reflect positively on her moral character and even her personal wisdom.⁹¹

An intriguing reference to Theano comes from the second-century *Onomasticon* of the grammarian Julius Pollux: “But I do not accept the most colloquial and rather clichéd [τεθρυλημένον] words *oikodespotēs* and *oikodespoina*, as you know; I remind you that I even found both these terms in the letter of Theano the Pythagorean woman written to Timareta.”⁹² From Pollux’ brief report of the recipient and contents, this letter does not seem identical to any of the extant letters.⁹³ Its loss is unfortunate, because this is the only ancient attestation to Theano as an author specifically of letters. Still, her Pythagorean connection is once again reinforced.

Clement of Alexandria mentions Theano three times in the *Stromateis*. In the first of his attestations, he highlights the fact that Theano is a writer: “In his book about Pythagorean philosophy Didymus reports that Theano the Crotonian was the first [πρώτην] among women to study philosophy

παλαιάς καὶ Κορνηλίας τῆς Σκιπίωνος καὶ ὅσαι ἐγένοντο θαυμασταὶ καὶ περιβόητοι, ταῦτα δ’ ἔξεστι περικειμένην προῖκα καὶ κοσμουμένην αὐτοῖς ἐνδόξως ἅμα βιοῦν καὶ μακαρίως, *Advice, Mor.* 145E–F (48). For further data on the other named women, see Pomeroy, ed., *Plutarch’s “Advice,”* 56–57.

⁹¹ Pomeroy anticipates part of my argument when she states that “Plutarch was not a historian, but a biographer and moral philosopher. He has little sense of change over time, and therefore does not hesitate to refer to female moral exemplars from earlier periods of Greek history Without urging by Plutarch and other authorities, women like Eurydice were not likely to follow the example of Theano, wife of Pythagoras, who lived in the fifth century BC in an austere philosophical community and was concerned lest her arms be seen by strangers” (ibid., 41). Earlier Pomeroy has commented that “... the text is replete with analogies and quotations from earlier literature and from *famous* men and women of Greek antiquity” (ibid., 33; my italics). Of course, as a moralist (and not a historian), Plutarch has chosen women whose lives and teachings illustrate his various points. His perception is not that Theano is a figure far removed from his present, living in an impossible-to-replicate community; rather, he calls upon her reputation as a female philosopher whose wisdom is well-known to his students, and whose way of life could and ought to be emulated, at least in some general terms.

⁹² τὸ κοινότατον τοῦτ’ καὶ μᾶλλον τεθρυλημένον, τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην καὶ τὴν οἰκοδέσποιαν, οὐκ ἀποδέχομαι μὲν τοῦνομα, ὥς δὲ ἔχῃς εἰδέναι, μὴνύω σοι ὅτι καὶ ταῦτα ἄμφω εὗρον ἐν Θεανοῦς τῆς Πυθαγόρου γυναικὸς ἐπιστολῇ πρὸς Τιμαρέταν γραφείῃ, *Onom.* 10.21. The *Onomasticon* consists primarily of a thesaurus of terms (*OCD*, s.v. “Pollux, Iulius”), and this citation seems to reflect a language-snobbery on Pollux’s part. No letter from Theano to Timareta is extant, but Thesleff includes this attestation in his list of Theano’s “texts” (*The Pythagorean Texts*, 200).

⁹³ Of course, *Theano to Kallisto* comes the closest to matching the contents of this unknown letter, since it uses the words “δεσπότης” (line 11) and “δεσποίνης” (line 37), but without the *oiko-*prefix.

and to write poems.”⁹⁴ That she is “first among women” may be a temporal statement, so that, like Pythagoras, she is perceived as being “present at the creation” of philosophy, or, at least, of philosophy for women; or “first” may also mean “foremost,” or “most prominent” among the female Pythagoreans; both meanings may blend in his description.

Another reference to Theano by Clement provides a sample of her writing. Charging that non-Christians do not understand that Christian martyrdom by violent death leads to eternal life,⁹⁵ Clement quotes two Greek philosophers whom he believes share the view from “our scriptures” (ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων ... γραφῶν):

For Theano the Pythagorean writes: “For life would be truly a feast to the wicked, who although they had acted badly; when they die, if the soul were not immortal, death would be a godsend.” And Plato in the *Phaedo* “For if death were release from everything, it would be a godsend,” and so forth.⁹⁶

The full context of this writing attributed to Theano is not extant, but Clement’s example does establish her as a known author. He illustrates her esteemed position within philosophy by following up her statement with one from Plato.

The third record of Theano in the *Stromateis* is found in a section called “Women as Well as Men Capable of Perfection,” which begins with the thesis: “In this perfection it is possible for both a man and a woman to share equally.”⁹⁷ This chapter goes on to give an annotated list of many good

⁹⁴ Δίδυμος δ’ ἐν τῷ περὶ Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας Θεανὴν τὴν Κροτωνιάτιν πρῶτην γυναικῶν φιλοσοφῆσαι καὶ ποιήματα γράψαι ἱστορεῖ, *Strom.* 1.16.80. Commenting on this statement in the *Stromateis*, Hawley notes, “The quest for an inventor of something (the *protos heurètes*) is typical of Greek tradition” (“Problem of Women Philosophers,” 77). Clement’s reference is to Arius Didymus, a late first-century BCE source, who was also used by Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Eusebius, and Stobaeus. For a critical edition of his writings, see *Arius Didymus: Epitome of Stoic Ethics* (Arthur J. Pomeroy, ed.; Texts and Translations 44; Graeco-Roman 14; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).

⁹⁵ Clement says these persons “do not know that such a gate of death is the beginning of the true life,” οὐκ εἰδότες τῆς ὄντως οὐσης ζωῆς ἀρχὴν εἶναι τὴν τοιαύτην τοῦ θανάτου πύλην, *Strom.* 4.7.44.

⁹⁶ Θεανὴν γὰρ ἡ Πυθαγορικὴ γράφει· ἦν γὰρ ἂν τῷ ὄντι τοῖς κακοῖς εὐωχία ὁ βίος πονηρευσαμένων· ἔπειτα τελευτῶσιν, εἰ μὴ ἦν ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ, ἔρμαιον ὁ θάνατος. καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Φαίδωνι εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ὁ θάνατος τοῦ παντός ἀπαλλαγὴ, ἔρμαιον ἂν ἦν καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, *Strom.* 4.7.44.

⁹⁷ Ταύτης τοι τῆς τελειότητος ἕξεσιν ἐπ’ ἴσης μὲν ἀνδρί, ἐπ’ ἴσης δὲ καὶ γυναικὶ μεταλαβεῖν, *Strom.* 4.19.118. Although Clement affirms that both men and women can learn and exhibit virtue, he struggles with the bodily differences between male and female, and decides that the woman, “in accordance with the particular construction of the body, [is fit] for pregnancy and housekeeping,” κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ιδιότητα, ἐπὶ τὰς κυήσεις καὶ τὴν οἰκουρίαν,

women, beginning with four from Jewish texts: Judith, Esther, Susanna and “the sister of Moses.” But after that, Clement proceeds to female philosophers of various schools.⁹⁸ Theano is cited for her (womanly) philosophical acumen through two *χρεῖαι*, the first one about her exposed arm already seen in Plutarch and the second about women’s ritual purity previously found in Theon:

Did not Theano the Pythagorean achieve such a level of philosophical bearing, that when the busybody stared and said “Your arm is beautiful,” she answered, “But it does not belong to the public.” That saying of greatest dignity by the same woman is in circulation: that when she was asked how many days a woman [must] be separated from a man to go into the Thesmophoria, she said, “From her own, indeed immediately! But from another, never!”⁹⁹

Strom. 4.8.60 (“Women As Well As Men, Slaves As Well As Freedmen, Candidates for the Martyr’s Crown”). Later in that same discourse he states: “Therefore, women also ought to philosophize similarly to men, even if the males happen to be best at everything, unless they become effeminate,” *φιλοσοφητέον οὖν καὶ ταῖς γυναῖξιν ἐμφερώς τοῖς ἀνδράσι, κὰν βελτίους οἱ ἄρρενες ἐν πᾶσι φερόμενοι τυγχάνωσιν, ἐκτός ἐστι μὴ καταμαλακισθεῖν*, *Strom.* 4.8.62.

⁹⁸ Again, this list includes Theano’s daughter Myia, along with Hipparchia, Arete, Aspasia, and Sappho, among other virtuous women (I count thirty in all) who were poets, philosophers, and painters. Mention is made of these women’s superior modesty in bathing, bravery in battle and torture, and their success at studying philosophy. Sarah, wife of Abraham, is anomalously placed near the end, along with “Hebrew maidens” and Nausicaä of Homer, as women who performed ordinary household tasks (Sarah baked cakes for the angels), *Strom.* 4.19.121. For additional names and the position of Myia in Clement’s text, see the discussion of “Myia” above, esp. n. 58.

⁹⁹ οὐχὶ Θεανῶ μὲν ἢ Πυθαγορικῇ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦκεν φιλοσοφίας ὥς πρὸς τὸν περιέργως ἀπιδόντα καὶ εἰπόντα καλὸς ὁ πῆχυς, ἀλλ’ οὐ δημόσιος ἀποκρίνασθαι. τῆς αὐτῆς φέρεται σεμνότητος κάκεινο τὸ ἀπόφθεγμα· ἐρωτηθεῖσα γάρ, ποστὰία γυνὴ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς εἰς τὸ θεσμοφόριον κάτεισιν, ἀπὸ μὲν ἰδίου καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔφη, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδεπώποτε, *Strom.* 4.19.121. These sayings from Theano are the only direct speech by a woman in this entire section. For the first chreia, the words of Theano and her questioner are exactly the same as in Plutarch (see above, 117–119), but the narrative setup is different (here with reference to a male “busybody”, which brings to mind the younger widows who are accused of being *περιέργοι* in 1 Tim 5:13). In the second chreia, the words ascribed to Theano are nearly identical to those found in Diogenes Laertius (see below; the addition of *καὶ* in her response hardly counts), but again the setup differs, especially in the inclusion of the Thesmophoria as the ritual for which a woman needs to be purified. Diogenes’ report uses the more general *καθαρεύει* in place of the *εἰς τὸ θεσμοφόριον κάτεισιν* in *Strom.* An extended form of the first chreia is used by Clement in another text, but this time not attributed to any one woman, as an example of how a good woman ought to speak: “And indeed, that pretty voice must speak her opinion very decorously to one who says: ‘Your arm is beautiful,’ ‘But it does not belong to the public,’ and ‘Your shoulders are beautiful,’ ‘But only,’ she may say, ‘for my husband,’ and ‘Your face is lovely,’ ‘But only for my spouse,’” *Καίτοι δυνατόν ἀποφθέγξασθαι μάλα κοσμίως τὴν ἀστείαν ἐκείνην φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα· Καλὸς ὁ πῆχυς, Ἄλλ’ οὐ δημόσιος, καὶ· Κνήμαι καλαί, Ἄλλὰ μόνου, φάναι, τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ ἐμου, καί· Πρόσωπον εὐπρεπές, Ἄλλὰ μόνου τοῦ γεγαμηκότος*, *Paid.* 2.114.2.

Clement has assembled such female exemplars in order to offer demonstrations that Christian women, both free and slave, likewise can become virtuous.¹⁰⁰ For Clement, remembering the activities of famous virtuous persons—male and female—is part of the process of developing Christian excellence, and Theano is a particularly apt example of women's virtue. It is important to note that Theano was well-known to this highly-educated *Christian* author, which suggests that some data about her, however fragmentary and legendary, could generally be found in the “curriculum” of Greco-Roman *paideia*.

Three ancient biographical sources testify to the fame of Theano as the wife of Pythagoras.¹⁰¹ In his *Life of Pythagoras*,¹⁰² Diogenes Laertius expresses two views of Theano's relationship to Pythagoras: “And Pythagoras also had a wife, whose name was Theano, daughter of Brontinus of Croton. Others say, the wife of Brontinus, and female-disciple of Pythagoras.”¹⁰³ Theano is also mentioned in conjunction with Telauges: “And Telauges was their son ‘Telauges, famous son of Theano and Pythagoras.’ Writings of Telauges are not in circulation, but from his mother Theano some are.”¹⁰⁴ Not enough information is given to confirm whether the extant letters ascribed to Theano are those mentioned by Diogenes, but the reference does indicate that Theano was thought to be an author of texts (συγγράμματα).

In addition, Diogenes records one of the *χρεῖαι* also found in Clement's *Stromateis*, adding some further advice for women:

But also they say that when she was asked: “When is a woman cleansed from her man?” she said, “From her own immediately, from another, never.” And she advised the woman about to go to her own husband to lay aside her shame along with her clothing, and rising up again to take them up together again.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Interestingly, Clement does not include here any women from early Christian literature even though he cites Pauline letters that name women who were known to Paul.

¹⁰¹ Kahn describes these works: “We have three lives of Pythagoras from late antiquity, by Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and Iamblichus, in that order; and each is more marvelous than its predecessor” (*Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans*, 5). In turn, these three relied in part on a text by Aristoxenus, “... and many of the more marvelous or moralistic features of the later biography ... must go back to this lost work of Aristoxenus” (*ibid.*, 69).

¹⁰² Richard Hope provides a wide range of dates for this work, from the beginning of the third century CE to as late as the fourth century (*The Book of Diogenes Laertius: Its Spirit and Its Method* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1930], 8–9).

¹⁰³ Ἦν δὲ τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ καὶ γυνή, Θεανῷ ὄνομα, Βροντίνου τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου θυγάτηρ· οἱ δὲ, γυναῖκα μὲν εἶναι Βροντίνου, μαθήτριαν δὲ Πυθαγόρου, *Vitae Phil.* 8.42.

¹⁰⁴ Ἦν καὶ Τηλαύγης υἱὸς αὐτοῖς ... Τηλαυγες, κλυτὲ κοῦρε Θεανοῦς Πυθαγόρῳ τε. σύγγραμμα δὲ φέρεται τοῦ Τηλαύγου οὐδέν, τῆς δὲ μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Θεανοῦς τινα, *Vitae Phil.* 8.43.

¹⁰⁵ ἀλλὰ καὶ φασιν αὐτὴν ἐρωτηθεῖσαν ποστὰι γυνὴ ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς καθαρεύει, φάναι, ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου παραχρήμα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδέποτε. τῇ δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα μελλούσῃ πορεύεσθαι

In all the chreiai recounted so far, the good Theano pithily states the necessity for virtuous women to remain faithful within marriage. Theano asserts that a wife need not feel ashamed in sexual intercourse with her husband.¹⁰⁶

Theano is mentioned once more in *Vitae Philosophorum* in a summing up formula: “But since we have recounted about Pythagoras, we must speak about the Pythagoreans of high repute ... Then about Theano and Telauges we have recounted”¹⁰⁷ Her esteem is secured in the descriptive phrase “Pythagoreans of high repute” (τῶν ἐλλογίμων Πυθαγορικῶν).

As already discussed above, Porphyry’s *Vita Pythagorae* affirms that Theano “led” the other wives of Kroton,¹⁰⁸ which conveys the perception of

παρήγει ἅμα τοῖς ἐνδύμασι καὶ τὴν αἰσχύνην ἀποτίθεσθαι, ἀνισταμένην τε πάλιν ἅμ’ αὐτοῖσιν ἀναλαμβάνειν, *Vitae Phil.* 8.43.

¹⁰⁶ Later, Iamblichus puts this saying, but not the “advice” about marital sex, into the speech of Pythagoras to the women of Kroton, *VP* 54–55. Since the full collection of “Pseudopythagorica” comes from diverse times, places, and authors, no common “Neopythagorean sexual ethic” can be determined from the texts. Certainly, wives were expected to abstain from sex with men other than their husbands, as is evident throughout the letters under consideration and in two treatises by Periktione and Phintys. Pythagoras was remembered as instructing husbands to “avoid licentiousness,” as detailed below in the Iamblichus’ account of Theano’s appeal to her husband (n. 113).

¹⁰⁷ Ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ Πυθαγόρου διεληλύθαμεν, ῥητέον περὶ τῶν ἐλλογίμων Πυθαγορικῶν ... περὶ μὲν οὖν Θεανοῦς καὶ Τηλαύγους διειλέγμεθα, *Vitae Phil.* 8.50.

¹⁰⁸ This reference has already been discussed in the section above on Myia. “But others record as the offspring of Theano, daughter of Pythonax of the Cretan race: Telauges, son of Pythagoras, and daughter Myia, but others also Arignote; whose Pythagorean writings also are preserved. Timaeus recounts that the daughter of Pythagoras as a young woman also led the young women in Kroton, and that his wife [led] the wives,” ἄλλοι δ’ ἐκ Θεανοῦς τῆς Πυθάνακτος τὸ γένος Κρήσης υἱὸν Τηλαύγη Πυθαγόρου ἀναγράφουσι καὶ θυγατέρα Μυίαν, οἱ δὲ καὶ Ἀριγνῶτην· ὣν καὶ συγγράμματα Πυθαγόρεια σῴζεσθαι. Τίμαιος δ’ ἱστορεῖ τὴν Πυθαγόρου θυγατέρα καὶ παρθένον οὖσαν ἡγείσθαι τῶν παρθένων ἐν Κρότωνι καὶ γυναῖκα τῶν γυναικῶν, *Vita Pyth.* 4. Another possible daughter of Pythagoras is mentioned as the one who preserved his writings: “He also had a daughter, Damo, as Lysis says in his letter to Hippasos; when writing about Pythagoras he says the following: “Many are saying you even philosophized publicly, which Pythagoras deemed unworthy, who, when he deposited his commentaries to the keeping of Damo, his own daughter, laid a strict charge on her not to hand them over to anyone outside the house. Although she was able to sell his discourses for much money, she did not wish to; but she was always considering poverty and her father’s injunction to be worth more than gold, even though she was a woman,” ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ θυγάτηρ Δαμῶ, ὥς φησι Λύσις ἐν ἐπιστολῇ τῇ πρὸς Ἱππασον, περὶ Πυθαγόρου λέγων οὕτως· λέγοντι δὲ πολλοὶ τὸ καὶ δαμοσίᾳ φιλοσοφῆν, ὅπερ ἀπαξίωσε Πυθαγόρας ὅς γέ τοι Δαμοὶ τῆ ἑαυτοῦ θυγατρὶ παρακαταθέμενος τὰ ὑπομνάματα ἐπέσκαψε μηδενὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς τὰς οἰκίας παραδιδόμεν. ἃ δὲ δυναμένα πολλῶν χρημάτων ἀποδίδοσθαι τῶς λόγως οὐκ ἐβουλάθη· πενίαν δὲ καὶ τὰς τῷ πατρὶ ἐπιστάφιας ἐνόμιζε χρυσῷ τιμιωτέρας ἡμεν, καὶ ταῦτα γυνά, *Diog. Laer.* 8.42. (Note the Doricisms in the text, which Diogenes cites from a “letter of Lysis to Hippasus.”) Damo

her as an exceptional role model not just for those earlier women, but as a viable example for women of Porphyry's time. His account also mentions Theano in connection with Pythagoras' first arrival at Croton:

When he set foot on Italy and came to Croton, Dikaiarchos reports, he arrived after many surpassing travels, and being naturally well-endowed by fate (for his form was that of a free man and mighty and full of grace, and he possessed decorum in voice and character and in all other attributes), thus the city of the Crotonians was well-disposed so that he won over the office of the elders by many and good discourses, so that, under orders from the rulers, in turn he exhorted the young men appropriately for their age; and after these, [he exhorted] the children gathered in crowds from their schools; then the women, and an assembly of the women was arranged for him. And when these things happened, high opinion about him increased, and he received many people from this city as disciples, not only men but also women (one of whom was Theano), and his name was made famous, and [he took as disciples] many kings and rulers from the neighboring barbarous region.¹⁰⁹

In this description, Theano is the only named disciple of the many people, both men and women, whom Pythagoras received as students from the city and the surrounding area, echoing the earlier statement from the *Anonymus Photii* that Theano was a disciple of Pythagoras. Since no further information about her is given, this suggests the expectation that the reader would already recognize both her relationship to Pythagoras and her own good reputation.

By the time of the *de Vita Pythagorica* by the Neoplatonist Iamblichus,¹¹⁰ the chreia about a wife's ritual purity receives three Pythagorean attributions:

is also named as the first heir of Pythagoras' ὑπομνήματα in Iamblichus, *de Vita Pythagorica*, 28.146.

¹⁰⁹ ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐπέβη καὶ ἐν Κρότωνι ἐγένετο, φησὶν ὁ Δικαίαρχος, ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἀφικομένου πολυπλάνου τε καὶ περιττοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης εὖ κεχορηγημένου, τὴν τε γὰρ ιδέα εἶναι ἐλευθέριον καὶ μέγαν χάριν τε πλείστην καὶ κόσμον ἐπὶ τῆς φωνῆς καὶ τοῦ ἥθους καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἔχειν, οὕτως διαθεῖναι τὴν Κροτωνιατῶν πόλιν ὥστ' ἐπεὶ τὸ τῶν γερόντων ἀρχεῖον ἐψυχαγώγησεν πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ διαλεχθεῖς, τοῖς νέοις πάλιν ἡθικὰς ἐποίησας παραινέσεις ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων κελευσθεῖς· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῖς παισὶν ἐκ τῶν διδασκαλείων ἀθρόοις συνελθοῦσιν· εἶτα ταῖς γυναῖξιν καὶ γυναικῶν σύλλογος αὐτῷ κατεσκευάσθη. γενομένων δὲ τούτων μεγάλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ἠὺξήθη δόξα, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἔλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως ὁμιλητάς οὐ μόνον ἀνδρας ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκας, ὧν μίᾳ γε Θεανοῦς καὶ διεβοήθη τοῦνομα, πολλοὺς δ' ἀπὸ τῆς σύνεγγυς βαρβάρου χώρας βασιλεῖς τε καὶ δυνάστας, VP, 18–19.

¹¹⁰ This philosopher lived ca. the mid-third c. to ca. 324 CE, and was later enthusiastically admired by the Emperor Julian. For a brief summary of Iamblichus' interest in Pythagoreanism, see Riedweg, *Pythagoras*, 127–128.

And still they say that Pythagoras uttered the famous statement about intercourse: “from the man one lives with, one is pure to go that same day to the temples; but from a man not one’s own, never.”¹¹¹

To Deino, the wife of Brontinos one of the Pythagoreans, who was a wise and exceptional soul, belongs also the good and admirable remark, *which some attribute to Theano*, that a woman who has arisen from her own husband should sacrifice that same day.¹¹²

Tacked on to this “attribution” to Theano, Iamblichus adds a story that exemplifies Diogenes’ statement that Theano “led” the wives of Croton:

At this point, the wives of the Crotonians approached to ask this woman [Theano] about persuading Pythagoras to lecture their husbands about *sōphrosynē* toward them. What happened was that, after the woman [Theano] promised and Pythagoras spoke, and the Crotonians were altogether persuaded, the licentiousness that then prevailed was eradicated.¹¹³

In this situation, Theano acts as an envoy to Pythagoras for the Crotonian women on a matter—husbandly *sōphrosynē*—which her husband evidently exemplifies in their own marriage. His agreement to speak, along with the ready response of the men of Croton, implicitly demonstrate Theano’s effectiveness as a virtuous woman.

Pythagoras’ family was thought to have played a large role in the transmission of his philosophical teachings. Iamblichus recounts that the women in Pythagoras’ family were the custodians of whatever writings he had left.¹¹⁴

Whether the writings [on the mysteries of Orpheus] are really those of that man [Pythagoras], as most people say, or, as some of the highly regarded and trustworthy members of the school affirm, of Telauges, from the notes left by Pythagoras to his daughter Damo, sister of Telauges; they report that after her death [the notes] were given to Bitale, daughter of Damo, and who was the same age as Telauges (son of Pythagoras and husband of Bitale). For he

¹¹¹ ἔτι δὲ τὸ περιβόητον γενόμενον ἀποφθέγξασθαι κατὰ τὴν σύνοδον, ὡς ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ συνοικοῦντος ἀνδρός ὅσιόν ἐστιν αὐθημερόν προσιέναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ προσήκοντος οὐδέποτε, *VP* 55. See LSJ, s.v. σύνοδος, I.A.5, for this word as “intercourse.”

¹¹² πρὸς Δεινῷ γὰρ τὴν Βροντίνου γυναῖκα, τῶν Πυθαγορείων ἑνός, οὖσαν σοφὴν τε καὶ περιττὴν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἧς ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ καλὸν καὶ περίβλεπτον ῥῆμα, τὸ τὴν γυναῖκα δεῖν θύειν αὐθημερόν ἀνισταμένην ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτῆς ἀνδρός, ὃ τινες εἰς Θεανὴ ἀναφέρουσι, *VP* 132; my italics.

¹¹³ πρὸς δὴ ταύτην παρελθούσας τὰς τῶν Κροτωνιατῶν γυναῖκας παρακαλέσαι περὶ τοῦ συμπίσαι τὸν Πυθαγόραν διαλεχθῆναι περὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτάς σωφροσύνης τοῖς ἀνδράσιν αὐτῶν, ὃ δὴ καὶ συμβῆναι, καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς ἐπαγγελαμένης καὶ τοῦ Πυθαγόρου διαλεχθέντος καὶ τῶν Κροτωνιατῶν πεισθέντων ἀναιρεθῆναι παντάπασι τὴν τότε ἐπιπολάζουσαν ἀκολασίαν, *VP* 132.

¹¹⁴ See also n. 108 above, on Diogenes Laertius’ account of the transmission of Pythagoras’ notes.

was quite young at the death of Pythagoras, and he was left with Theano, his mother.¹¹⁵

In this account, Theano has receded into the background as “mother,” while Pythagoras’ *ὑπομνήματα* are passed down from his daughter Damo to his granddaughter Bitale.¹¹⁶

Theano appears again in Iamblichus’ *VP* as wife and mother in the immediate leadership succession after Pythagoras’ death.

Aristaius, son of Damophon of Croton, is agreed by all to have been the successor of Pythagoras, who lived in Pythagoras’ own time, nearly seven generations before Plato. And he was found worthy not only of the school, but also of bringing up the children and of marriage to Theano, on account of his special mastery of the doctrines.¹¹⁷

Theano herself has become part of the Pythagorean legacy, handed over to Aristaius. She and her children are surrounded by Pythagorean wisdom all their lives, and their presence in the succession authenticates the transmission of the philosophical tradition.

One further mention of Theano is found at the end of Iamblichus’ work, in a list of the names of famous Pythagorean women.

The most distinguished Pythagorean women are: Timycha wife of Myllias of Croton, Philtys daughter of Theophris of Croton and sister of Byndacus, Occelo and Eccelo (sisters of Occelus and Occilus from Leukania), Cheilonis

¹¹⁵ εἴτε ὄντως τοῦ ἀνδρός, ὡς οἱ πλείστοι λέγουσι, σύγγραμμά ἐστιν, εἴτε Τηλαύγους, ὡς ἔνιοι τοῦ διδασκαλείου ἐλλόγμιοι καὶ ἀξιόπιστοι διαβεβαιοῦνται ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων τῶν Δαμοῖ τῇ θυγατρὶ, ἀδελφῇ δὲ Τηλαύγους, ἀπολειφθέντων ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ Πυθαγόρου, ἅπερ μετὰ θάνατον ἱστοροῦσι δοθῆναι Βιτάλῃ τε τῇ Δαμοῦς θυγατρὶ καὶ Τηλαύγει ἐν ἡλικίᾳ γενομένῳ, υἱῷ μὲν Πυθαγόρου, ἀνδρὶ δὲ τῆς Βιτάλης· κομιδῇ γὰρ νέος ὑπὸ τὸν Πυθαγόρου θάνατον ἀπολελειμμένος ἦν παρὰ Θεανοῖ τῇ μητρὶ, *VP* 146.

¹¹⁶ In this account, Bitale seems to have married Telauges, her uncle, who was about her own age.

¹¹⁷ Διάδοχος δὲ πρὸς πάντων ὁμολογεῖται Πυθαγόρου γεγονέναι Ἀρισταῖος Δαμοφώντος ὁ Κροτωνιάτης, κατ’ αὐτὸν Πυθαγόραν τοῖς χρόνοις γενόμενος, ἑπτὰ γενεαῖς ἔγγιστα πρὸ Πλάτωνος· καὶ οὐ μόνον τῆς σχολῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς παιδοτροφίας καὶ τοῦ Θεανοῦ γάμου κατηξιώθη διὰ τὸ ἐξαιρέτως περικεκρατηκέναι τῶν δογματῶν, *VP* 264–265. Aristaius was not a young man at this point, as Iamblichus continues: “Pythagoras himself is said to have led the school for thirty-nine years; he lived almost a hundred years in all, and Aristaius was very old when he [Pythagoras] handed over the school to him,” αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόραν ἀφηγῆσθαι λέγεται ἐνὸς δέοντος ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα, τὰ πάντα βιώσαντα ἔτη ἑγγὺς τῶν ἑκατὸν, παραδοῦναι δὲ Ἀρισταίῳ τὴν σχολὴν πρεσβυτάτῳ ὄντι, *VP* 265. According to this source, Theano thus had two older men as husbands, but the “hundred year” life of Pythagoras is one of those round numbers easily doubted. How old would his children have been at his death? Telauges is said to be “young,” so is this a story of a miraculous birth to older parents, as in the account of Abraham and Sarah, among others?

daughter of Cheilon the Lacedaemonian, Cratesicleia of Lacainia wife of Cleanor the Lacedaemonian, Theano wife of the Metapontian Brontinus, Myia wife of Milon of Croton, Lastheneia of Arcadia, Habroteleia daughter of Habroteles of Tarentum, Echecrateia of Phliasia, Tyrsenis of Sybaris, Peisirrhoe of Tarentum, Theadousa of Lacaina, Boeo of Argos, Babelyca of Argos, Cleaechma sister of Autocharidas of Lakonia. Seventeen [women] in all.¹¹⁸

The list reveals the confusion in Iamblichus' sources, for "Theano" is remembered not as the wife of Pythagoras, but as the wife of Brontinus (whose wife was "Deino" in *VP* 132).¹¹⁹ In any case, the name of Theano itself has retained its distinction. With this inventory, Iamblichus perpetuates the recollection that the Pythagorean philosophical school consisted of women as well as men, and that many of the women were linked to the movement by family ties, being the wives, daughters, and sisters of men who were also Pythagorean.

To summarize, unlike Diogenes and Porphyry, Iamblichus does not connect Theano with the authorship of any texts at all; Pythagoras' "notes" have supposedly been preserved not by Theano, but by the following generations of her daughter and granddaughter. Further, although Iamblichus acknowledges differing attributions for the apophthegm about a woman's purity, he has initially placed it in Pythagoras' mouth, unlike Diogenes, who gave Theano the speaking part. For Iamblichus, her one active role has been to persuade Pythagoras to lecture the men of Croton about marital faithfulness. Still, the name "Theano" is woven into the wider Pythagorean "family" of later generations and students of the great man.

¹¹⁸ Πυθαγορίδες δὲ γυναῖκας αἱ ἐπιφανέσταται· Τιμύχα γυνὴ ἡ Μυλλία τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Φιλτὺς θυγάτηρ Θεόφριος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Βυνδάκου ἀδελφή, Ὀκαεὼ καὶ Ἐκαεὼ ἀδελφαὶ Ὀκαέλω καὶ Ὀκαίλῳ τῶν Λευκανῶν, Χειλωνὶς θυγάτηρ Χειλῶνος τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου, Κρατησίχλεια Λάκαινα γυνὴ Κλεάνορος τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου, Θεανὼ γυνὴ τοῦ Μεταποντίνου Βροτίνου, Μυία γυνὴ Μίλωνος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Λασθένεια Ἀρκάδισσα, Ἀβροτέλεια Ἀβροτέλους θυγάτηρ τοῦ Ταραντίνου, Ἐχεκράτεια Φλιασία, Τυρσηνὶς Συβαρίτις, Πεισιρρόδη Ταραντινὶς, Θεάδουσα Λάκαινα, Βοῖω Ἀργεῖα, Βαβελύκα Ἀργεῖα, Κλεαίχμα ἀδελφὴ Αὐτοχαρίδα τοῦ Λάκωνος. αἱ πάσαι ιζ, *VP* 267.

¹¹⁹ I would think that the female members of Pythagoras' family might rise to the top of such a list, and that they might also have merited some note of their familial relationship to Pythagoras. But while a Theano and a Myia are listed here, their relationship to Pythagoras is not claimed; nor are his other daughters Arignote and Damo or his granddaughter, Bitale, even on the list. Perhaps this is an example of Iamblichus' scrambled sources, or his own inadequate editing. What remains is a list of many women who are connected to famous male Pythagoreans, which is yet another example of Hawley's thesis that "... women did not study philosophy alone. Often they entered the world through male relations ..." ("Problem of Women Philosophers," 84). This is certainly the case for Theano, who is remembered as the wife of Pythagoras, then wife of his successor Aristaius, and the mother of Telauges, or, alternately, as the wife of the Pythagorean Brontinus.

A contemporary of Iamblichus, Eusebius of Caesarea, makes one brief comment about Theano, and this in a section that claims that Hebrew history preceded all of the Greek philosophers. Reciting a list of Jewish figures beginning with Moses, and continuing on through the post-exilic prophets, Eusebius then turns to the times of the Greek philosophers.¹²⁰ Citing other pre-Socratic worthies, he comes to the time of Anaxagoras, saying,

At the same time as Anaxagoras men who were natural philosophers, Xenophon and Pythagoras flourished. Then Theano his wife [ἡ γυνή] and his sons Telauges and Mnesarchos succeeded Pythagoras.¹²¹

Around the same time, Gregory of Nazianzus mentions Theano in passing in his oration against the Emperor Julian. Complaining that Julian's admiration for the philosophical way of life and death does not extend to the holy lives and martyrdoms of Christians, he cites the imperial praise for "the Pythagorean way of life in relation to the beans, and Theano's contempt of the death."¹²² This fleeting reference to Theano is explained in a later Syriac manuscript,¹²³ which recounts that when arrested and questioned by a tyrant who wanted to know Pythagorean mysteries, Theano bit off her own tongue and spit it at the feet of that man, rather than reveal those secrets under torture.¹²⁴ Gregory's brief allusion shows a different side of Theano's fine Pythagorean reputation, demonstrating her capacity for philosophical virtue.

¹²⁰ In *Praep. Ev.* 10.14.9, he dates Solon and the Seven Sages contemporaneous with Cyrus of Persia, asserting: "no philosopher among them is remembered as older," παλαιότερος οὐδεὶς παρ' αὐτοῖς φιλόσοφος μνημονεύεται.

¹²¹ κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τῷ Ἀναξαγόρᾳ χρόνῳ ἤχμασαν ἄνδρες φυσικοὶ Ξενοφάνης τε καὶ Πυθαγόρας. τὸν μὲν οὖν Πυθαγόραν διεδέξατο Θεανὴ ἡ γυνὴ οἱ τε υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, Τηλαύγης καὶ Μνήσαρχος, *Praep. Ev.* 10.14.14.

¹²² καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν κυάμων Πυθαγορικὴν ἔνστασιν, καὶ θανάτου περιφρόνησιν Θεανοῦς, *Contra Julianum imperiatorem* 592.

¹²³ A. Mingana, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts, vol. 3: Additional Christian Arabic and Syriac Manuscripts* (Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1939), 95–101; cited in Ute Possek, "Der 'Rat der Theano': Eine pythagoreische Spruchsammlung in syrischer Übersetzung," *Le Muséon* 111:1–2 [1998]: 15).

¹²⁴ There are famous stories about philosophers who bit off their tongues under torture rather than revealing secrets. Tertullian recounted it about an Athenian (*Ad martyras*, 4.7). Clement of Alexandria says that Zeno of Elea, Theodotus the Pythagorean, and Paulus, friend of Lacydes all "behaved similarly" (*Strom.* 4.8.1; the chapter titled "Women as well as men, slaves as well as freemen, candidates for the martyr's crown"). Diogenes Laertius reports it of the Pythagorean Anaxarchus (*VP* 9.59). Iamblichus tells it of Timycha the Lacedaemonian, another female Pythagorean supposedly tortured by "Dionysios the tyrant" (*VP* 189–194). These accounts are discussed in Possek, "Der 'Rat der Theano,'" 15–17.

The Christian author, Theodoret (fifth century CE), twice makes mention of Theano. The first seems to rely upon Eusebius' *Praep. Ev*:

At the same time as Anaxagoras, also lived Pythagoras. But his wife [ἡ γαμετή] Theano and Telauges and Mnesarchos, his children, succeeded [to] the way of life of Pythagoras¹²⁵

In the second reference, Theodoret adopts the chreiai from Clement (and others):

Theano the Pythagorean, when some man looked at her and said, "Your arm is beautiful," replied, "But it does not belong to the public." And again she was asked, "How many days after [being with] a man may a woman go down to the Thesmophoria?" "From her own husband, immediately," she said, "But from another, never!"¹²⁶

Theano is also featured in the *Anthologium* assembled by Stobaeus.¹²⁷ This collection contains the fragment "On Piety,"¹²⁸ and three chreiai:

- (1) "Theano the Pythagorean, when asked how she will be held in esteem, said, 'By working at the loom and sharing my marriage bed.'"¹²⁹

¹²⁵ κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐγενέσθην Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ Πυθαγόρας. Ἀλλὰ τὴν Πυθαγόρου μὲν διατριβὴν ἡ γαμετὴ Θεανὸς διεδέξατο καὶ Τηλαύγης καὶ Μνήσαρχος οἱ τοῦτου παῖδες, *De Caritate* 2.23. The parallels between Eusebius and Theodoret are easily seen in the Greek, although it is curious that Theodoret makes two changes: from γυνὴ to γαμετή, and from "succeeded Pythagoras" to "succeeded the way of life of Pythagoras." This serves to emphasize that they faithfully maintained the Pythagorean lifestyle.

¹²⁶ Θεανὸς δὲ ἡ Πυθαγορικὴ, ἀποβλέψαντός τινος εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ εἰπόντος· Καλὸς ὁ πῆχυς, ἀλλ' οὐ δημόσιος ἀπεκρίνατο. Ἐρωτηθεῖσα δὲ πάλιν· Ποσταία γυνὴ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς εἰς τὸ Θεσμοφόριον κάτεισιν; Ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου παραχρῆμα ἔφη, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, οὐδέποτε. Compare from Clement: οὐχὶ Θεανὸς μὲν ἡ Πυθαγορικὴ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦκεν φιλοσοφίας ὥς πρὸς τὸν περιέργως ἀπιδόντα καὶ εἰπόντα καλὸς ὁ πῆχυς, ἀλλ' οὐ δημόσιος ἀποκρίνασθαι. τῆς αὐτῆς φέρεται σεμνότητος κάκεινο τὸ ἀπόφθεγμα· ἐρωτηθεῖσα γάρ, ποσταία γυνὴ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς εἰς τὸ θεσμοφόριον κάτεισιν, ἀπὸ μὲν ἰδίου καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔφη, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδεπώποτε, *De Caritate* 12.73.

¹²⁷ The date for the *Anthologium* is probably the fifth c. CE (*OCD*, s.v. "Stobaeus," 1445). The sources for the *Anthologium* and Stobaeus' editing process of them are unclear, as stated in *Der Neue Pauly*: "Aufgrund des schichtenhaften Charakters des Werks ist es nicht leicht, die Hand des S. von seinen Quellen zu unterscheiden Die Quellenfrage ist problematisch: Eine aus verschiedenen Autoren zusammengestellte Anthologie ist gemeinsame Quelle für S. und Theophrilos von Antiocheia, *Ad Autolyicum* andere Hypothesen bleiben unbeweisbar" ("Stobaios," *DNP*, 1007). As already noted, Stobaeus does not include any of the *letters* by women Pythagoreans, only the *treatises* by the Pythagorean women Phintys and Perictione and the references to Theano.

¹²⁸ Περὶ εὐσεβείας, Stob., *Anth.* 1.10.13 (W.-H. 125).

¹²⁹ Θεανὸς ἡ Πυθαγόρειος ἐρωτηθεῖσα πῶς ἔνδοξος ἔσται. ἔφη· ἴσθον ἐπιχοιμένην καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιώσασα, *Anth.* 4.23.32 (W.-H. 580). Regarding the last clause, LSJ notes: "c. acc. rei, only in ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιώσασα, euphem. for *sharing* it, only in *Il* 1.31," s.v. ἀντιώσω.

- (2) “Theano the Pythagorean philosopher, when asked how many days after [being with] a man is a woman purified, ‘From her own,’ she said, ‘immediately, but from another man, never!’”¹³⁰
- (3) “Theano, when asked what might be fitting for a wife, said, ‘To please her own husband.’”¹³¹

The first and third of these chreiai are new material, while the second is the one found in the writings of Plutarch, Clement, Diogenes, Iamblichus, and Theodoret.¹³² In each instance, the anecdote shows Theano offering a wise saying about an issue of wifely behavior. Her judgments about that behavior are viewed as entirely virtuous, emerging from and contributing to the positive reputation she possesses. Furthermore, in the first two chreiai Stobaeus has either adopted or added the label “Pythagorean”; and the second of these also stresses that she is a φιλόσοφος.¹³³ Thus we find that by the time of the *Anthologium*, Theano is still well-known as a Pythagorean who provided teaching appropriate for women’s virtue.

The well-known chreia about a woman’s purity after sex and before attending the Thesmophoria surfaces once again, this time in the “elaboration” exercises of Ps.-Nicolaus (probably post-sixth c. CE).¹³⁴ The rhetorical handbook places Theano in a securely gendered position:

For when the sexes were divided and performing their tasks in accord with their gender, Pythagoras, by his philosophy, united the sexes with a view to virtue in this way: by persuading women to honor philosophy as men do naturally. And so, many women have benefitted from the wisdom of Pythagoras, but most of all Theano, concerning whom what else needs mentioning except the kind of rules she legislated about self-control [σωφροσύνη].¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Θεανὼ ἡ Πυθαγορικὴ φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεῖσα ποσताία γυνὴ ἀπ’ ἀνδρὸς καθαρεύει, ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου εἶπε παραχρήμα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδέποτε, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.53 (W.-H. 586.20–587.2).

¹³¹ Θεανὼ ἐρωτηθεῖσα τί πρέπον εἴη γυναικί, τὸ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἔφη ἀρέσκειν ἀνδρί, *Anth.* 4.23.55 (W.-H. 587.8–10).

¹³² This is nearly the same as that of Diogenes, except for a change in the introduction and the switch from φάναι to εἶπε. Diogenes’ version has, with changed words in brackets: [ἀλλὰ καὶ φασιν αὐτὴν ἐρωτηθεῖσαν] ποσताία γυνὴ ἀπ’ ἀνδρὸς καθαρεύει, [φάναι,] ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου παραχρήμα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδέποτε.

¹³³ There is no feminine form of the Greek noun.

¹³⁴ Hock and O’Neil cite from *Progymnasmata* 3, Chreia Elaboration 2 (1.274, 7–275.15) in the 1832 edition by Christian Walz (*The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric. Vol. 2: Classroom Exercises*, 218–223).

¹³⁵ Διηρημένων γὰρ τῶν γενῶν καὶ πρὸς τὰς φύσεις ποιουμένων τὰς πράξεις Πυθαγόρας φιλοσοφῶν συνήψε τὰ γένη πρὸς ἀρετὴν οὕτω· γυναικῆς φιλοσοφίαν ἀναπεύθων τιμᾶν, ὥς ἄνδρες πεφύκασι.

The chreia ends by making another connection between the couple: “Consequently, let the man who admires Theano admire the wisdom of Pythagoras.”¹³⁶ Hock and O’Neil observe that while Theano is “the only woman who is the πρόσωπον of an elaborated chreia,” here it is Pythagoras who is the object of the praise instead of Theano.¹³⁷

A last extant Greek text about Theano the Pythagorean is found in the *Suda*, which lists three women named “Theano”:

83—Theano, Metapontian or Thurian woman, Pythagorean, daughter of Leophron, but wife of Karystos or Kroton or Brotinos the Pythagorean. She wrote “About Pythagoras,” “About Virtue” to Hippodamos the Thurian, “Women’s Exhortations,” and “Apophthegms of the Pythagoreans.”¹³⁸

84—Theano, Cretan woman, philosopher, daughter of Pythonax, but wife of the great Pythagoras, from whom she had Telauges and Mnesarchos and Myia and Arignote. Some record that this woman was wife of Brotinus and her race Crotonian. She wrote Philosophical Notes and Apophthegms and a work of epic poetry.¹³⁹

85—Theano, Locrian, lyric female poet; she wrote lyric or Locrian hymns and melodies.¹⁴⁰

The women in entries 83 and 84 are both designated as “Pythagorean” and married to male Pythagoreans,¹⁴¹ while the third, a poet, appears unrelated to philosophy. What is equally important is that each of the three women listed in the *Suda* is credited with writing texts. Although the sources seem to be confusing to the editor of the *Suda*, the items serve as records of the estimable reputation of Theano more than a millennium after the woman may have lived.

Καὶ πολλὰ μὲν τῆς Πυθαγόρου σοφίας ἀπώναντο· μάλιστα δὲ Θεανώ, περὶ ἧς τί δει̃ τάλλα διεξελεθεῖν, ἀλλ’ οἷα περὶ σωφροσύνης ἐνομοθέτησεν, *Prog.* 25.1; trans. Hock and O’Neil.

¹³⁶ ‘Ο τοῖνυν θαυμάζων τὴν Θεανώ τὴν Πυθαγόρου θαυμαζέτω σοφίαν, *Prog.* 25.8.

¹³⁷ *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric*. Vol. 2, 205–206.

¹³⁸ Θεανώ, Μεταποντίνη ἢ Θουρία, Πυθαγορεία, θυγάτηρ Λεώφρονος, γαμετὴ δὲ Καρύστου ἢ Κρότωνος ἢ Βρωτίνου τοῦ Πυθαγορείου. αὕτη ἔγραψε περὶ Πυθαγόρου, Περὶ ἀρετῆς Ἱπποδάμω Θουρίῳ, Παραινέσεις γυναικείας καὶ Ἀποφθέγματα Πυθαγορείων.

¹³⁹ Θεανώ, Κρησῶσα, φιλόσοφος, θυγάτηρ μὲν Πυθώνακτος, γαμετὴ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου Πυθαγόρου, ἐξ οὗ ἔσχε Τηλαύγην καὶ Μνήσαρχον καὶ Μυίαν καὶ Ἀριγνώτην. τινὲς δὲ Βρωτίνου αὐτὴν γενέσθαι γυναῖκα γράφουσι καὶ τὸ γένος Κροτωνιάτιν. Ὑπομνήματα φιλόσοφα, καὶ Ἀποφθέγματα, καὶ ποιήματ’ τι δι’ ἐπῶν.

¹⁴⁰ Θεανώ, Λοκρίς, λυρική· ἄσματα λυρικά ἢ Λοκρικά καὶ μέλη.

¹⁴¹ These two entries clearly reflect the confusion also found in Iamblichus about Theano’s husband—was he Pythagoras or Bro[n]tinus? The situation of the two entries in the *Suda* seems to have influenced Waithe and Harper’s construction of “Theano I” and “Theano II,” a division also accepted by P. Allen, *Concept of Woman*, 21. This “two-author theory” is discussed and doubted by Plant, *Women Writers*, 68–69.

Apart from Greek attestations of the Pythagorean Theano, one Syriac manuscript, *Or. Add.* 14.658, dated to the late sixth or seventh centuries CE, contains a large number (63+)¹⁴² of sayings under the heading “The Advice of Theano, a Philosopher of the House of Pythagoras.”¹⁴³ Not one of the complete proverbial sayings makes any mention of women or of feminine virtue or behavior; instead, they cover traditional moral philosophical topics, such as wealth, friendship, good works, flattery, anger, and true freedom. However, three statements from the very end of the manuscript, translated and numbered by David Monaco, refer to “feminine” topics:

#67—I, Theano, a woman, a philosopher gave water to drink to ... not ... for a woman to do what she said and she may take possession of her husband.

#69—For I was saying to the woman who from a slap ... an advantage

#70—For not ... wicked beauty or excellent perception, for if these two manners are discovered in her, wealth which does not impoverish will define her ... I say [that] there is nothing which ... shame like a woman, for I know from my soul that everything to be observed easily¹⁴⁴

Even such fragmentary evidence indicates that Theano was known as “a woman, a philosopher,” and as someone whose philosophical advice at least at times took up the *topos* of “the good woman.”

I have already referred to the Syriac story of Theano’s bravery in the face of torture that gives clues as to what Gregory of Nazianzus supposedly meant

¹⁴² The number of sayings is unclear, due to very fragmentary ending of the manuscript. The original editor, E. Sachau, made out sixty-four sayings (*Inedita Syriaca: Über die Reste der syrischen Übersetzungen classischgriechischer, nichtaristotelischer Literatur unter den nitrischen Handschriften des Britischen Museums*, in *Hermes* 4 [1870], 70–75). Possekkel points out that Sachau had a memory lapse at saying # 34, thus she includes only sixty-three sayings. (Five of these sayings are likewise found in *Or. Add.* 14.614, another Syriac manuscript from same monastery [dated to the seventh c. CE].) I am grateful to my colleague, David Monaco, for invaluable assistance on the Syriac manuscripts. In working on his dissertation on the “Sentences of the Syriac Menander,” Monaco found these sayings attributed to Theano at the (unfortunately very fragmentary) end of *Or. Add.* 14.658 (from the monastery of Deir al-Suriani, and dated by Monaco to the late sixth c. CE). His recent research on the document at the British Museum allowed him to provide partial translations of seven additional sayings, bringing the total to seventy.

¹⁴³ Translation of the heading by Monaco. Another Syriac source, *Liber Syriacus* 331, from the Oriental Institute at Oxford, contains two other sayings that open: “Theano the philosopher ...” (trans. Monaco; discussed in Possekkel, “Der ‘Rat der Theano,’” 15, 22). The first deals with the excellence of freedom over slavery; the second with true friendship. According to Possekkel, included along with Theano’s “Advice” are other philosophical texts by Aristotle, Porphyry, discourses by Sergius of Reshaina, a collection of saying by Pythagoras, and sayings and definitions ascribed to Plato (*ibid.*, 13–14).

¹⁴⁴ These are translated and numbered by Monaco in an unpublished document. The ellipses indicate unreadable characters in the manuscript.

by “Theano’s contempt of death.” The Syriac sources indicate: (1) Theano’s reputation had spread across the Roman world, reaching as far as Syriac-speaking areas of the East; and (2) educated Christian scribes there also knew of her reputation as a moral philosopher.¹⁴⁵

In sum, the numerous attestations to the woman Theano, while occasionally unclear,¹⁴⁶ are unanimous in perceiving her as a woman known for her “philosophizing” and, in most cases, her philosophizing about women and feminine virtue. For the purposes of understanding the function of the pseudonymous letters written under her name, it is significant that “Theano” was a famous figure from the Pythagorean past and thus was considered valuable as an authorial name for later moral philosophical letters addressed to women. My examination of sources about Theano shows that this small treasury of stories, maxims, and mentions of her always depict her in a laudatory manner. Her own excellent moral character is unquestioned and is reflected in her familial relationships, in her Pythagorean credentials, and in the chreiai connected to her name. For many centuries, for both pagan and Christian writers, it was believed that Theano acted in a manner similar to that of famous male philosophers, offering her wisdom on living well in both oral and written forms, with much of her advice focused on the *topos* of “the good woman.” In point of fact, her female sex made her an especially appropriate advisor on “women’s issues”; her role as the pre-eminent philosopher-wife of the great Pythagoras¹⁴⁷ meant that her name was infused with a positive celebrity and, in every case, suggested a woman to be imitated as an exemplar of feminine virtue.¹⁴⁸

One remarkable fact stands out: while four of the ancient sources reveal that Theano was the author of some texts,¹⁴⁹ only one of them—Julius

¹⁴⁵ According to Possekel, “... Theano [genoß] im syrischsprachigen Raum großes Ansehen genoß. Dieses erhellt auch daraus, daß die syrische Überlieferung eine viel größere Anzahl von Sprüchen Theanos bewahrt hat als die griechische Tradition” (“Der ‘Rat der Theano,’” 17).

¹⁴⁶ For instance, “her exact relationship to Pythagoras was the subject of some speculation” (Plant, *Women Writers*, 68). Yet, as Städele concludes, “zur engsten Umgebung des Pythagoras gehört sie wie Myia in jedem Falle” (*Die Briefe*, 288).

¹⁴⁷ Or, if “Theano” as a girl’s name was also given by parents in honor of the priestess in the *Iliad*, then the name had acquired even more positive resonance within the Greco-Roman world.

¹⁴⁸ Using Aristotle’s rhetorical delineation, the name “Theano” would thus convey a strong ῥήσος as one means of persuasion. See the further discussion below on the function of pseudonyms in the letters.

¹⁴⁹ Pollux, *Onom.* 10.21; Clement, *Strom.* 1.16.80; 4.7.44; Diog. Laer., *VP* 8.43; *Suda*, “Theta,” 83 and 84. It is unclear if the Syriac sayings of Theano were originally oral teaching and, if so, how they came to be in this written form.

Pollux—mentions any letters ascribed to her. Unfortunately, that reference is too sketchy to identify with any extant letter.¹⁵⁰ It appears, then, that the illustrious memory of this early Pythagorean woman led to the later production of letters written under her name. The author of the letters adopted the name “Theano” because it was well-known; thus the stories of her virtuous life as a female philosopher, married to the legendary Pythagoras himself and the mother of the his children, provide the basis for the authority of the letters.¹⁵¹ The epistolary pseudonym draws upon the widespread reputation of Theano as a female philosopher, but common public knowledge shows no prior awareness that she was the author of letters. This is substantiated by the fact that Plutarch, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Eusebius, and Stobaeus credit no writings to her at all. In fact, the absolute rarity of texts written by Theano (as well as the lack of evidence of any texts attributed to Myia and Melissa) may have suggested to certain anonymous author(s) the incredible usefulness of composing such letters, especially letters that focused on moral-philosophical *paraenesis* for women.

Given that the evidence strongly suggests that these letters are indeed pseudepigraphical, we ought to revisit Waithe's question: were the *real* authors of the Pythagorean women's letters male or female?¹⁵² There are two

¹⁵⁰ Another item suggestive of the letters is the *Suda*'s ascription to a Theano of “Women's Exhortations [Παραινέσεις],” but this is not a convincing attestation to the letters. Thesleff says of this work: “Only the title is known; but cf. the letters below” (*Introduction*, 22); cf. also, Thesleff, *Pythagorean Texts*, 195 n. 6.

¹⁵¹ This ancient evidence attesting to Theano has been read “in reverse”; that is, that the letters and other written material ascribed to Theano triggered the “historical tradition” about her, which includes those legends, personal relationships, and sayings treated above. Plant proposes that some of the accounts and details “may be based on inferences from various pseudonymous texts published in her name” (*Women Writers*, 68), but he does not cite any specific evidence for this assertion. If that is the case, then we would be dealing here with a reinforcing circularity: Theano is a celebrated personage who wrote letters, and the letters then lend their own renown to the reputation of Theano. Or, which came first, the letters or the author? But it seems to me that this is often the situation with the writing and subsequent reading of ancient pseudepigraphical texts. The bottom line is that for the letters to be valuable and subsequently preserved, the named author is the first and dominant basis for their popularity. In fact, as Plant nearly argues against himself, Theano became “a credible historical and philosophical figure with a reputation as an ideal wife and mother. She provided an example of the application of Pythagorean philosophy in a woman's life and was therefore an attractive subject for pseudonymous writers” (*ibid.*, 68).

¹⁵² This question typifies one of the contributions of women's historical studies: raising issues that before the twentieth-century feminist movement did not occur to, or at least, were categorically dismissed by earlier scholars. In this way, fresh insights may be gained by asking new questions of a relatively static evidentiary base such as literary works from the Greco-Roman world.

options: the letters may have been written by women who chose to write under another name, that of a famous female figure from the Pythagorean past, to aid in the reception and preservation of their compositions. On the other hand, perhaps men actually wrote these texts and the female pseudonyms suggest the expectation in antiquity that it was these philosophical women who had a special responsibility to instruct other women on these issues, even though male philosophers also sometimes took on that duty.¹⁵³

In my judgment, the question of whether the pseudepigraphers were *male* or *female* is unanswerable for three reasons. First, it fails on account of the common ancient practice of adopting the pseudonym of a famous person from the past when writing letters that convey something about moral-philosophy: the real authors deliberately hide themselves behind the pseudonym. Second, there can be no appeal to the writing style as being particularly “feminine,”¹⁵⁴ because the warm personal tone (both “loving” and “reproving”) of the letters, which might be thought to be especially womanly, is similar to that of letters written by or attributed to men. Such a “friendly” style characterizes the classical belief that a letter is a representation of a personal relationship.¹⁵⁵ In any case, we have no other letters by women to provide a thorough comparison. Third, the evidence of the Pythagorean women’s letters completely supports Hawley’s analysis of literary “patterns” concerning female philosophers: the very presence of women in philosophical circles needed to be “explained” by relating them to a male philosopher and by portraying their virtues as feminine and distinct from

¹⁵³ Xenophon, Pythagoras, Plutarch, Musonius, et al.

¹⁵⁴ Modern analyses of women’s and men’s writings have been shown to be wholly influenced by the readers’ knowledge of the sex of the author, as the linguist Dale Spender demonstrates (*The Writing or the Sex?, or, Why you don’t have to read women’s writing to know it’s no good* [New York: Pergamon, 1989]). Her socio-linguistic studies of reading “blindly,” that is, giving the reader no clues about the author, showed that the author’s sex cannot be determined by examining the writing style. (This is similar to the idea of conducting “blind auditions” for musicians, so that the sex, ethnicity, age, or even just body language of the instrumentalist cannot influence hiring decisions.) It might be fruitful to perform such a study of, say Plutarch’s and Theano’s advice to brides, or Musonius Rufus’ and Phintys’ treatises on philosophizing women.

¹⁵⁵ Or, as Hans-Josef Klauck describes it: “The author’s [Seneca] devotion of his attention to his absent friend [Lucilius] through the medium of the friendly letter, which was the ideal letter type in antiquity, creates an emotional bond between author and reader” (with the collaboration of Daniel P. Bailey, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006], 172).

the masculine.¹⁵⁶ Given the dominance of this ideological context, no certain determination can be made about the sex of the “real” author.¹⁵⁷

Despite this uncertainty, it is clear from my analysis of the historical, philosophical, and religious attestations to Theano, Myia, and Melissa that Waithe’s first claim that the Pythagorean texts are not pseudonymous is untenable. Her assumption that “these women were early Pythagoreans of substantial initial fame and subsequent total obscurity” is patently erroneous. Since the named authors were indeed famous female figures from a Pythagorean past, it is clear that the epistolary attributions are best explained by the premise that the letters are part of the same literary context that gave rise to the rest of the ancient “Pseudopythagorica.” This receives further substantiation from that fact that the female pseudonyms have particular functions within this epistolary “philosophical project” of moral education for women, as we shall establish in the next section.

THE FUNCTION OF FEMALE PSEUDONYMS IN THE PYTHAGOREAN LETTERS

The first and arguably most prominent feature of a pseudepigraphical letter is its named author, who is a famous figure from the past. Interpretation of any letter must take into account its author, pseudonymous or not, but in a pseudepigraphical letter the writer’s name and identity are particularly significant because they have been specially chosen as a piece of the letter’s framework. From the important study by Lewis Donelson, I have gleaned four ways in which the authorial pseudonym functions in such a letter. It should be remembered that these techniques are interlocking, inseparable, and reinforce each other in adding realistic notes and context to the letters.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ This is the thesis of his “The Problem of Women Philosophers,” cited in nn. 28, 94, 119. Taylor sees a similar goal for Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa*: “In describing the women specifically in the Mareotic group, Philo’s chief rhetorical aim was to present them as ‘the good’ At every stage, the women have to be completely virtuous. For this, he needed to fit his description of the women of this group with wider notions of ‘good’ philosophical women, and avoid any association of his women with the negative paradigms ...” (*Jewish Women Philosophers*, 227).

¹⁵⁷ Thus pseudepigraphy poses a grave problem for Waithe’s project of rediscovering “previously lost works of women philosophers,” as I have noted above.

¹⁵⁸ My inventory of these four functions broadens from Donelson’s discussion of the “devices” of pseudepigraphical letters (*Pseudepigraphy*, 8, 10, and 23). Donelson has supplied no systematic list of literary techniques, and does not attempt to define a new genre—that of

First, the pseudonym *indicates the larger ideological (i.e., religious and/or philosophical) context* within which to read the letter and allows the reader to fill in any gaps with his or her general knowledge about that philosophical school, especially with legends about its founder or loyal members. The names “Melissa,” “Myia,” and “Theano” are clearly positioned within well-known and much-honored Pythagoreanism: the reader is led to believe that the content of their letters corresponds to Pythagorean philosophy and practices.

In a second step, the famous name *supports the purpose of transmitting a certain tradition* by means of the letter, perhaps especially if, like Pythagoras and Socrates, that person left no writings at all.¹⁵⁹ The well-known fact that women were present in the early Pythagorean community lends historical authenticity to the letters, while also explaining how these women could philosophize without compromising their feminine virtue: their tradition taught women how to practice philosophy appropriately *as women*.

Thirdly, a pseudonym *bestows the authority of a famous person* on the content of the text, thus attracting readers and increasing the letter’s chances of being preserved.¹⁶⁰ Pseudepigraphical letters found in the composite form of

pseudepigraphical letter—nor is he interested in probing the psychological motivations of the ancient writers of such letters; rather, he offers a literary analysis that examines the forms and functions of “religious” pseudepigraphical letters, especially those with similarities to the Pastorals (ibid., 3, 8).

¹⁵⁹ Donelson summarizes: “The evidence for respect for a figure of the past being sufficient and primary motivation for pseudonymity is overwhelming. Of special interest in this regard is the Neo-Pythagorean literature which was written many years after Pythagoras’ death by disciples who had the unfortunate problem that Pythagoras left nothing behind in writing” (ibid., 10 n. 9).

¹⁶⁰ Or, as Donelson says of Christian pseudepigrapha, “You wrote in the name of an apostle simply because that apostle had greater credence than you or any contemporary did and by so doing your own ideas or the ideas of your sect were given greater credence” (ibid., 20). Rosenmeyer raises the especially helpful proposal that ancient pseudonymous letters may have their roots in the rhetorical school exercise of *ethopoieia*: “These authors [of pseudonymous letters] approached their subjects as if they were experimenting with the rhetorical trope of *ethopoieia*, a kind of impersonation originating in school exercises in which the speaker tried to illuminate a figure from the past through a more intimate character portrayal. Thus a well-known figure like Socrates is presented writing a letter or a series of letters to a friend or family member, revealing feelings, thoughts, ideas, and private experiences, all of which were carefully juxtaposed with enough historical and biographical data to make the text believable” (*Ancient Greek Literary Letters*, 6–7). For the Pythagorean women’s letters, then, one should imagine an author writing in response to questions like “what would Theano say to her friend who was too lax in her childrearing?” Or “what would Myia say if her friend had just given birth?” Or “what would a Melissa say to a young newly-wed woman?”

a collection likewise would have a greater likelihood of preservation, since they have more heft—literally as physical objects and symbolically as a body of thought on household topics from the famous figure(s). The endorsement of the Pythagorean women's names means that these letters (in collections) both draw upon and, at the same time, add to the authority that inheres to the larger tradition, so that for centuries they have attracted interested audiences.

But it is a fourth function of the pseudonym that is of particular importance for my project: the ancient philosophical letter *presents the named author as the teacher of the named recipient*. And furthermore, in the case of the letters attributed to Pythagorean women, *the gender of the author matters*: it appears that male letter-writers most often “teach” other men,¹⁶¹ while females have a special responsibility for the teaching of women.

As in the texts of the Socratic dialogues,¹⁶² the philosophical letter puts into writing what might have derived from oral teaching and, by means of this textual form, promotes training in moral philosophy, despite the distance and, eventually, time, that separate the sender and recipient. This is a philosophical modification of the general purpose of letter-writing, as Cancik-Lindemaier states: “an *every-day letter*, as is evident by its introductory formula, provides a stage for the meeting of writer and receiver. The *every-day letter* compensates for the deficiency that the receiver is not present. In the *epistle* this compensation is made a virtue, that is to say, a literary and philosophical device for staging a process of communication.”¹⁶³ That is, oral philosophical discussion is advanced and disseminated more broadly by textual, specifically epistolary, means.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ For example, Seneca's letters to Lucilius, *Pythagoras to Hieron*, *Lysis to Hipparchos*, and the letters of Apollonius of Tyana; most of the Cynic and Socratic Epistles are also male-to-male. A few purport to come from men to women, and some of those are between family member, e.g., Crates writing to his wife Hipparchia and the Socratic Aristippus who writes to his daughter Arete (*Ep.* 27).

¹⁶² The figure of Socrates stands out as the ancient teacher *par excellence*, and the dialectical method he employed to lead students to a true understanding of good living reverberates through the subsequent history of philosophical education. Of course, we only know of Socrates' *oral* teaching through the *writings* of his students Plato and Xenophon; so it is that, while his philosophical teaching began with verbal dialogical instruction it was fairly soon preserved and delivered in written form; see Aune, “Dialogue,” *The Westminster Dictionary*, 125.

¹⁶³ “Seneca's Collections of Epistles,” 104; my italics. Cancik-Lindemaier has retained here the distinction of “real letter” versus “epistle” (non-real letter) posed by Adolf Deissmann. For an overview of Deissmann's categorizations, see Stanley Kent Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 17–20.

¹⁶⁴ Whether there is a “preference” for oral over written instruction in philosophical

Although ancient philosophical letters call to mind the process of an educational dialogue à la Socrates' dialectic, they actually present only one-half of the conversation: the letter-writer's assessment of a situation, along with his or her written instruction directed toward a situation and person as the author perceives them.¹⁶⁵ Aune's observation of the speech-to-text process is helpful in understanding the form and function of philosophical letters:

The philosophical dialogues of Plato and Aristotle (the latter are lost) became literary models for subsequent dialogues, and the dialogue was one of the more popular literary genres of antiquity As the dialogue developed, the contributions by the main speaker increased in length, making the dialogue form appear increasing [sic] artificial, often simply an excuse for long *monologues* on various subjects.¹⁶⁶

The form of the philosophical letter offers a prime opportunity for a "monologue" on the part of the author-as-teacher as a textual means of delivering instruction.¹⁶⁷ Of course, in the case of pseudepigraphical letters it is the

movements cannot be conclusively determined. In spite of the seeming benefit of in-person communication, epistolary correspondence was highly regarded as a representation of friendship and relationship. Philosophical letter-writers sometimes discuss in their letters the benefits of teaching and learning by means of letters. The Cynic Diogenes affirms the valuable role of letters when writing to Hipparchia, wife of Crates: "I admire you for your eagerness in that, although you are a woman, you yearned for philosophy and have become one of our school, which has struck even men with awe for its austerity. But be earnest to bring to a finish what you have begun. And you will cap it off I am sure, if you should not be outstripped by Crates, your husband, and if you frequently write to me, your benefactor in philosophy. *For letters are worth a great deal and are not inferior to conversation (διαλέξεως) with people actually present,*" Ep. 3 (trans. Benjamin Fiore, in *The Cynic Epistles*; my italics). With this last sentence, the author of the probably pseudonymous letter strongly endorses the usefulness of letters, including this very one, equal to διαλέξις. This is a clever stance for the author to take, if "Diogenes" is actually no longer living.

¹⁶⁵ This reiterates a point made by Klauck regarding Seneca's letters: "The letter is especially well suited to the dialogical and communicative manner in which Seneca does philosophy. In conversation, which the letter form imitates, philosophical truth is transmitted not statically in one fell swoop but through a longer process of development" (*Ancient Letters and the New Testament*, 172).

¹⁶⁶ "Dialogue," *The Westminster Dictionary*, 125; my italics.

¹⁶⁷ The enduring dialogical nature of philosophical teachings also makes itself known in diatribal features within letters, wherein the author sometimes asks and answers his own questions, anticipate objections, and reproves the letter's recipient in imitation of the dialectic method. For a comprehensive analysis, see Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981); for a shorter summary, Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 129–134; and my discussion in Chapter Three of the diatribal elements of *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostratē*.

named sender who is placed in the teaching role, with the named recipient in the position of student.¹⁶⁸

In the case of the female Pythagorean pseudonyms, it is significant that Theano and Myia were believed to be schooled in Pythagoras' philosophy and were thus authorized as teachers. For instance, Clement of Alexandria submits: "In his book about Pythagorean philosophy Didymus reports that Theano the Crotonian was the first among women to study philosophy and to write poems" (*Strom.* 1.16.80). He later commends "Myia the daughter of Theano [(who) philosophized] the Pythagorean topics" (*Strom.* 4.19.121). The reputations of both of these women, then, provide fitting pseudonyms to attach to moral-philosophical letters. While there is no explicit attestation to any "Melissa" as a Pythagorean philosopher or teacher, the highly virtuous connotations of the bee-woman establish her name as worthy of advising on the topic of wifely *sōphrosynē*.¹⁶⁹

The epistolary construction of the teacher-student relationship is fostered by the fact that "the letter is the literary form which appropriately grants the intimacy required for representing a face-to-face communication."¹⁷⁰ However, to be specific, while philosophical letters do often have a friendly tone, we are not talking about a give-and-take dialogue in which each person has an equal say, where there is ample opportunity to hear and respond thoughtfully to the other person's opinions. In fact, the monological letters fully represent a major principle of philosophical education: the teacher-student relationship is a hierarchical one, in that the teacher possesses knowledge and life experience while the student is on the receiving end of all this wise advice.

The Pythagorean women's letters similarly reconstruct a hierarchical teacher-student relationship between sender and recipient. The named

¹⁶⁸ Occasionally letters from both teacher and student are found, as in the letters attributed to Diogenes, Crates, and Hipparchia, but even here, we do not possess the kind of dialogical *correspondence* that would naturally exist in real life, i.e., a letter from Crates to Diogenes asking for clarification on some point, and then Diogenes' response to that particular letter. See Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles*, 10–11, 14–18. Seneca does refer to the correspondence he received from Lucilius, along with concerns and questions that his named recipient (supposedly) expressed. The opening of *Melissa to Kleareta* suggests that "Kleareta" had written an earlier letter requesting help. "Melissa" writes back in response to her "... earnest wish to hear about a wife's decorous behavior ...," τὸ ... ἐσπουδασμένως ἐθέλεν ... ἀκοῦσαι περὶ γυναικὸς εὐκοσμίας, lines 2–4.

¹⁶⁹ One must remember here also that the stylized Doricisms link *Melissa to Kleareta* to a Pythagorean context.

¹⁷⁰ Cancik-Lindemaier, "Seneca's Epistles," 109.

women letter-writers are portrayed as superior to their subordinate (and likewise female) addressees, where the social superiority is based on their relative ages. The age distinction applies across the epistolary corpus, as I have already suggested in Chapter One, because *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Kallisto*, as the first and last letters in Composite Collection A, form an *inclusio* that is programmatic. Thus, all five letters may legitimately be read as older women writing advice (and censure) to younger women.

The opening of *Melissa to Kleareta* sets up the author as a more experienced woman, who is pleased with Kleareta's aptitude and interest in moral progress: "It appears to me that on your own you have most good attributes. For your earnest wish to hear about a wife's decorous behavior offers a good hope that you are going to grow old in accordance with virtue."¹⁷¹ Here Melissa looks down kindly at Kleareta from the heights of feminine virtue.

In *Myia to Phyllis* the named sender knows quite a bit more than the new mother-recipient: "Therefore, for the present it is not useless to write down these things for you, inasmuch as good expectation comes from the nursing that is according to this guideline. But, with God's help, we will again convey approved and suitable reminders concerning the raising of the child."¹⁷² The unusual ὑφαγέομαι gives the sense that Myia, having more experience in childrearing, is able to "show the way" to Phyllis, while Myia's promise to send further "reminders" (ὑπομνάσεις) evokes the ὑπομνήματα of the philosophical teachers.¹⁷³ As older women with more experience of life, both Myia and Melissa take a long view, looking out for the future of their younger female "students." They also realize that the learning process moves from one stage to another, which is, of course, the very definition of a "curriculum."

The author of Theano's letters establishes herself as a woman with teacherly authority vis-à-vis her three recipients. This is accomplished through the repeated use of the vocative φίλη, which is used thirteen times in her letters. This term signals a friendship between author and addressee, empha-

¹⁷¹ Αὐτομάτως ἐμὶν φαίνῃ πλεόνα τῶν καλῶν ἔχεν· τὸ γὰρ ἐσπουδασμένως ἐθέλεν τὸ ἀκοῦσαι περὶ γυναικὸς εὐκοσμίας καλὰν ἐλπίδα διδοῖ ὅτι μέλλεις πολιούσθαι κατ' ἀρετὴν, lines 2–5.

¹⁷² ταῦτα μὲν ὦν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος οὐκ ἀχρεῖον ὑπογράψαι τοι τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐκ τροφᾶς ἢ καττὸν ὑφαγέομενον γινομένης, θεῷ δὲ συλλαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῷ παιδὸς αὐθις τὰς ἐνδεχομένης καὶ ποτεοικνίας κομιούμες ὑπομνάσεις, lines 31–35.

¹⁷³ One definition for the plural form of this word is "dissertations or treatises written by philosophers, rhetoricians, and artists," LSJ, s.v. ὑπόμνημα. According to the previously cited quote from Iamblichus, Pythagoras' notes (τῶν ὑπομνημάτων) were given first to his daughter Damo, and then passed on to her daughter Bitale.

sizing both the warm feeling “Theano” has toward Euboule, Nikostrate, and Kallisto, as well as her fundamental right to give advice to women with less competence or experience in handling their situations correctly.

As will be further analyzed in Chapter Three, “Theano” assumes the role of a teacher responsible for censuring two of her addressees (Euboule and Nikostrate), so that they can change their ways and begin to progress in virtue. As one brief example, this precise and devastating judgment is directed at Euboule’s childrearing practices: “But you are nursing your children like the offspring of Sardanapallos, enfeebling the nature of the males by pleasures.”¹⁷⁴ In *Theano to Nikostrate*, the author is depicted as drawing upon her vast life-experience when she says, “I keep hearing of the madness of your husband, that he has a *hetaira*, and that you, in turn, regard him with jealous anger. But I, my dear, have known many men with this same illness; for it is as if they are hunted down by these women and controlled by [them], and they lose their mind.”¹⁷⁵ Clearly, the reader is meant to think that Theano has lived long enough to “have known *many men* with this same illness,”¹⁷⁶ whereas Nikostrate has attained less knowledge of the world of men.

An explicit mention of the relative ages of epistolary sender and recipient comes from *Theano to Kallisto*, which teasingly states:

Indeed, to you *younger women* authority has been given by custom to rule over the household slaves once you have been married, but the teaching ought to come from the *older women* because they are forever giving advice about household management. For it is good first to learn the things you do not know and to consider the counsel of the *older women* the most suitable; for a *young soul* must be brought up in these teachings from *girlhood* (lines 2–7).

In this *paraenetic* letter, the younger women are portrayed as in great need of learning what they “do not know,” since they have been thrown into the deep water of managing the household slaves as soon as they are married. The author claims the superior teaching role for the older women, not just at this particular moment in a young woman’s life, but from her girlhood.

¹⁷⁴ σὺ δ’ ὅσον Σαρδαναπάλλου γονὴν τιθνήῃ τὰ τέκνα, τὴν τῶν ἀρρένων φύσιν θρύπτουσα ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, lines 24–25. More information is given on Sardanapallos in the compositional analysis of *Theano to Euboule* in Chapter Three.

¹⁷⁵ Ἦκουον τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρός σου παράνοιαν, ὅτι τὴν ἐταίραν ἔχει, σὺ δὲ ὅτι ζηλοτυπεῖς αὐτόν. ἐγὼ δέ, ὦ φίλη, πολλοὺς ἔγνωκα τῆς αὐτῆς νόσου· θηρεύονται γάρ ὡς ἔοικεν ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν τούτων καὶ κατέχονται καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι νοῦν, lines 2–5.

¹⁷⁶ While her own husband Pythagoras was remembered as a model of sexual faithfulness and restraint, there was that episode of the women of Croton, who complained to Theano about their husbands’ licentiousness (Iambl., *VP* 132).

This responsibility for older women, once begun, is to be continually relied upon by subordinate younger women.¹⁷⁷

In addition to situating the *female* pseudonymous senders as older and superior philosophical teachers of younger and subordinate *female* students, the “real authors” exploit two other assumptions of ancient pedagogy to construct the letters as part of a particular educational project. The first is the perception that it is socially appropriate for young women in particular to take the inferior position of learner. Their teachers are either their own husbands¹⁷⁸ or older women, as has already been seen in the excerpt

¹⁷⁷ Determining actual Roman attitudes and practices toward older persons is a difficult task. Against the assumption that “traditional societies typically show respect for the aged,” Suzanne Dixon remarks that, “... ancient literature is full of the lament that contemporary youth lack the respect of the previous generation for the wisdom and experience of their elders ...” (*The Roman Family* [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992], 149). A treatise in Doricized Greek attributed to the Pythagorean Periktione warns “for there might be no greater human sin or injustice than to act impiously towards parents [lit., fathers],” μέζων γάρ ἀμαρτία καὶ ἀδικία ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο ἢ ἐς πατέρας ἀσεβεῖν, Stob., *Anth.* 4.25.50 (W.-H. 632.7–9). Although younger family members were expected to show *pietas* by material support toward their older relatives, Dixon also notes: “The genres of comedy, satire, and even erotic poetry ... often reveal a different attitude towards the aged, one of contempt, ridicule, and disgust” (*The Roman Family*, 151–152). Other ancient sources are highlighted in Malherbe, “How to Treat Old Women and Old Men: The Use of Philosophical Traditions and Scripture in 1 Timothy 5,” *Scripture and Traditions*, 2008: 263–290.

¹⁷⁸ See Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.10ff., where Ischomachus advances his young wife’s education in household management beyond what she received from her mother; also, Plutarch advises the husband Pollianus to extend his philosophical education to his wife, *Advice, Mor.* 145A (48). Likewise, 1 Corinthians 14:35a (whether part of an interpolation or not) gives this command for women: “If there is something they wish to learn, let them ask their own husbands at home,” εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν. The situation of male teachers of women other than their husbands is somewhat problematic, as will be seen in the discussion in Part Two on male teachers in the Pastorals. Musonius Rufus steers philosophizing women away from associations with male philosophers by recalling the women to their domestic duties: “Yes, by god, some say that women who come to philosophers are therefore to a great extent self-willed and arrogant, when abandoning their housekeeping they go about among men and practice discourses and speculate and investigate syllogisms, though they ought to sit at home spinning wool. But I would not think it worthy for women to philosophize in this way, nor men either, by abandoning their proper duties to be only concerned with discourses; but whatever discourses they take up, I say should be taken up for the sake of their duties,” ἀλλὰ νῆ Δία, φασί τινες, ὅτι αὐθάδεις ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ θρασεῖας εἶναι ἀνάγκη τὰς προσιούσας τοῖς φιλοσόφοις γυναῖκας, ὅταν ἀφέμεναι τοῦ οἰκοῦρεν ἐν μέσοις ἀναστρέφονται τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ μελετῶσι λόγους καὶ σοφίζονται καὶ ἀναλύωσι συλλογισμούς, δέον οἶκοι καθημένας ταλασιουργεῖν. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐχ ὅπως τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς φιλοσοφούσας ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀξιῶσαίμ’ ἂν ἀφεμένους τῶν προσηκόντων ἔργων εἶναι περὶ λόγους μόνον· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσους μεταχειρίζονται λόγους, τῶν ἔργων φημί δεῖν ἕνεκα μεταχειρίζεσθαι αὐτούς, *Fr.* 3 (Greek text from Lutz 42.11–19; my translation).

from *Theano* to *Kallisto* above.¹⁷⁹ The previously cited section of Porphyry's account suggests a similar process of women teaching women: "Timaeus recounts the daughter of Pythagoras who was a young woman also leading [ἡγεῖσθαι] the young women in Croton, and his wife [leading] the wives" (*Vita Pyth.* 4).

The second pedagogical assumption at work in the letters is that of the teacher as example for a student to imitate, a well-known ancient education method.¹⁸⁰ If each pseudonymous epistolary sender takes on the role of teacher, then she or he is established as an exemplary person for the reader to follow. The letter *Pythagoras to Hieron* speaks plainly of the author as an example: "My life is secure and quiet, but yours approaches mine in no respect."¹⁸¹ Donelson concludes that this letter sets up "the idealization of the pretended author and the concomitant use of the author as an ethical paradigm."¹⁸² Letters from Socrates also use his behavior paradigmatically, so that "a reader is thus presented with a choice of being like Socrates or

¹⁷⁹ Plutarch recommends to the young bride Eurydike a treatise on the love of fashion that was written by his own wife Timoxena to yet a third woman: "When it comes to love of ornament, Eurydike, you ought to try to memorize the things written by Timoxena to Aristylla," *περὶ δὲ φιλοκοσμίας σὺ μὲν, ὦ Εὐρυδικῇ, τὰ πρὸς Ἀρίστυλλαν ὑπὸ Τιμοξένας γεγραμμένα ἀναγνοῦσα περὶ δὲ διαμνημονεύειν*, *Advice, Mor.* 145A (48). The author of the *Pastorals* also subscribes to the notion of women teaching women in *Titus* 2:3–5, as will be investigated in Part Two.

¹⁸⁰ Malherbe claims "... personal examples in particular were used because they were regarded as more persuasive than words ... and as providing concrete models to imitate ... a philosopher's practical example of the principles he taught ... was thought to be a most important demonstration of his integrity" (*Moral Exhortation*, 135–136). Malherbe is thinking more of the use of examples as a rhetorical strategy in a text, rather than of the role of the epistolary author as teacher-example. Similarly, Fiore investigates "the use of example as a pedagogical tool ...," but notes that "... in addition to teaching the theory on the usefulness of examples, and offering examples of the theory in practice, the *good rhetor himself* is an example of the art that he teaches" (*Function of Personal Example*, 36; my italics). This is because, Fiore says, "... the teacher in the school is considered an extension of, or at least analogous to, the parent in the home. And both teacher and parent [are] expected to be *good examples* themselves ..." (*ibid.*, 36).

¹⁸¹ Ἀσφαλὴς ὁ ἐμὸς βίος καὶ ἡσυχίος, ὁ δὲ σὸς κατ' οὐδὲν ἐμοὶ προσπελάζει, lines 2–3. On the Socratic letters in general, Donelson remarks: "On numerous occasions the letters expressly admit to holding the pedagogical theory of imitation of great people, but this is not surprising since this was such a common Greco-Roman point of view" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 40–41).

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 33. Donelson stresses "the strong paradigmatic role Pythagoras plays in his letter to Hieron. He is portrayed as the ideal philosopher. There were hints of this phenomenon in the letters by Anacharsis, Crates, Diogenes, and Heraclitus. Crates in particular appears to be portrayed as an ideal. But Pythagoras' aggressive claim in this letter of possessing αὐτάρκεια clearly puts him in the special category of being a wise man" (*ibid.*).

like those he condemns.”¹⁸³ Fiore says that the choice to imitate Socrates is “implicit,” being based upon:

... all those aspects of the model figure's life and virtue which the letters delineate but do not single out in the direct call for imitation. Thus, Socrates invites the addressee of *Ep.6* ... to consider not just one feature, his attitude toward material gain, but also the rest of his moderate and “philosophical” way of life, as sketched by the letter.¹⁸⁴

Yet certainly, the use of the pseudonym “Socrates” is also meant to evoke events and virtues in the life of the famous philosopher that were not included at all in the letters.

It seems reasonable that such a biographical evocation is at work in the Pythagorean women's letters. Admittedly here the idea that the pseudonymous recipient, as well as the subsequent reader, might be persuaded to imitate the named sender is even more covert. Surprisingly, there is no “direct call for imitation” of the famous women, neither is there any mention of the *personalia* of their lives: no references to Pythagoras or other family members, no geographical locations or temporal indications.¹⁸⁵ On the other hand, nothing in the letters contradicts the extant sources about these women. Each reader must rely upon his or her own prior knowledge of Theano, Myia, and Melissa with their Pythagorean connections.¹⁸⁶ As has been shown, during Roman Imperial times stories about these women were widespread; these women were even elevated by educated Christian authors as examples for Christian women to follow. Without exception, ancient

¹⁸³ Ibid., 39.

¹⁸⁴ *Function of Personal Example*, 143.

¹⁸⁵ Personal details about the sender were sometimes included simply to add verisimilitude to a pseudepigraphical letter, as Donelson's comments on the Pastorals and the Platonic letters (*Pseudepigraphy*, 23–27). Rosenmeyer suggests a similar use for personal data: “The pseudonymous letters ... were certainly not historical documents. But their authors, who wrote in the voices of famous figures from the past, mixed in just enough historical information with their amusing invented scenarios to be convincing. They clearly found an eager audience for their historically informed imitations of great men's private correspondences. One can understand the desire to be privy to Socrates' or Solon's innermost thoughts expressed on paper, a desire so basic to human nature that one could forgive a person for imagining these pseudonymous letters to be genuine ...” (*Ancient Greek Literary Letters*, 5–6). With the Pythagorean women's letters, the recipients' personal situations are briefly sketched to give the pretext for the writing of the letters; thus, the epistolary occasions are as pseudepigraphical as the names of senders and recipients.

¹⁸⁶ This is one reason Waithe and other modern authors have misunderstood the function of the pseudonyms: they plainly do not possess the same knowledge and perceptions of Theano, Myia, and Melissa current during the time when the letters were first circulated and collected.

attestations to the Pythagorean women always uphold their feminine virtue, so that as epistolary teachers Theano, Myia, and Melissa still stand as examples for imitation.

The various elements of the letters interact with each other: for instance, the external biographical information that these senders were indeed very virtuous women strongly reinforces the instructional contents of each letter. This would mean that a reader of, say, *Theano to Nikostrate*, which censures the recipient for improper behavior toward her husband, would see the name "Theano," and remember the various chreiai where Theano advocates marital faithfulness along with public modesty. The entire letter would then be read as the authoritative words of the philosopher-wife of Pythagoras, who corroborated her own teachings with a personal morality that was above reproach. That letter would then be studied in light of the other letters in either *TH3* or Composite Collection A.

With only a few attestations to writings supposedly composed by Theano, along with the bare-bones stories about all three women from ancient sources, the real authors of these letters have no difficulty in filling the textual gaps left in the historical record. The letters succeed in part because they "present a consistent characterization and keep within the bounds of biographical accuracy and historical probability."¹⁸⁷ By assuming the role of female Pythagorean letter-writers, the authors take up the task of teaching moral philosophy in a form acceptable for women learners. This instruction is conveyed not only by the words of the letters, but by the virtuous behavior of the female authors who thus serve as exemplary figures for imitation by other women. It is certain that the good reputation of the stated names contributed to the eventual preservation of the letters, thus expanding the epistolary audience even beyond what the original authors could have anticipated: into the realm of modern scholarship.

¹⁸⁷ Rosenmeyer makes this claim for other pseudonymous epistolographers (*Ancient Greek Literary Letters*, 99).

CHAPTER THREE

TEACHING STRATEGIES

The collected letters from Melissa, Myia, and Theano serve as curricular resources for the moral development of women, seeking to bring the voices and virtues of those good female Pythagorean teachers to bear on the lives of women in the Roman Empire. But what kind of letters are these, and by what means do they seek to teach their audience? In this chapter, I examine each letter individually,¹ evaluating their genres and analyzing the various rhetorical strategies employed as instructional methods designed for ancient women in particular.

THE LETTER COLLECTION MM:

MELISSA TO KLEARETA AND MYIA TO PHYLLIS

Rhetorical Analysis of “Melissa to Kleareta,” a Paraenetic Letter

Melissa to Kleareta is a short, philophronetic letter written in the “plain style” advocated by (Pseudo-) Demetrius’ *On Style*.² Aside from the Doricisms, the Greek is not particularly complex in syntax or vocabulary. The letter opens with an assumed occasion: that of a newly-married woman who wants to learn how to become truly virtuous. “Melissa” first offers a reassurance regarding “Kleareta’s” present state of goodness, and then predicts that even more virtue will accrue to the recipient as she grows older. This comment which looks into the future of “Kleareta’s” old age forms a sort of *inclusio* with the conclusion that the beauty and wealth of one’s soul is “present in good order even to death” (τὰ δὲ μέχρι θανάτῳ πάρεντι ἔκτε-ταμένα, lines 26–27). In between, we find practical advice about how a wife ought to exhibit *sōphrosynē*: in marital fidelity, modest adornment, and good household management. The argumentation in this letter moves from one

¹ To maintain consistency, the individual letters are nonetheless presented in the sequence most commonly found in the manuscripts: *MK*, *MPh*, *ThE*, *ThN*, and *ThK*.

² “Plain” is the translation of ἰσχνότης in *Eloc.* 223 and 235. See the discussion of *On Style* in Klauck, *Ancient Letters*, 184–188.

basically unsupported proposition to the next. However, one important “reason” given is the negative example of the predatory *hetairai*, who allegedly wear flashy clothing in order to hunt their male prey. At the close of the letter, an appeal is made to the enduring value of inner beauty and wealth, as opposed to the acquisition of more transient glamour and possessions.

The flow of this epistolary argument corresponds most closely to the characteristics of a paraenetic letter: in *Melissa to Kleareta* the sender gives advice that the recipient already knows she ought to enact.³ Stanley Stowers describes such a letter: “The basic elements in paraenesis are precepts, examples, discussions of tradition moral topics (*topoi*), encouraging reminders of what the readers already know and have accomplished, and reasons for recommended behavior. Paraenetic letters are generally dominated by encouraging types of exhortation”⁴ Most of these paraenetic elements are present in *Melissa to Kleareta*, which is especially “encouraging” in tone.

³ Considerations of the genre and style of *Melissa to Kleareta* lead to the complicated position of paraenesis and paraenetic literature vis-à-vis Greco-Roman rhetoric. The problem is that “paraenesis” denoted a range of forms, contents, and/or styles, so that an authoritative definition has never been agreed-upon in antiquity, or in modern scholarship. For an informative summary of scholarship, see Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (1st Amer. ed.; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), 50–53.

A separate issue is how to translate *παράνσεις* and related terms. As far as possible, I transliterate the word “paraenesis,” rather than using “exhortation,” “advice,” “counsel,” and other such English words. It seems to me that mixing English “synonyms” for *παράνσεις* exacerbates the lack of a fixed definition for paraenesis in the ancient discussions themselves. Others might characterize *Melissa to Kleareta* as “moral exhortation” (as does Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 83–85).

⁴ *Letter Writing*, 96. Stowers continues: “although words of admonition or mild rebuke here and there could be appropriate Consolatory sections are also frequently parts of these complex letters of exhortation” (ibid.). His terms highlight the difficulties encountered in attempting to match up the twenty-one “epistolary types” of Ps.-Demetrius with the forty-one “epistolary styles” of Ps.-Libanius. See the helpful chart in Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary*, 164; as Aune says, “It is striking that just thirteen categories overlap” (ibid., 163). Of course, many ancient letters in actuality are of “mixed types,” as Stowers’ description suggests. To this broad range of paraenetic features, Aune adds the presence of vice and virtue lists (*New Testament and Its Literary Environment* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987], 194–196). Malherbe remarks that in paraenesis: “The example is frequently delineated antithetically,” summing up with “paraenetic advice may be diverse in content and consist of brief admonitions strung together” (*Moral Exhortation*, 125). Further discussion of the characteristic elements of paraenetic letters may be found in Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 23, and especially ch. 10: “Letters of Exhortation and Advice.”

One classical definition of the paraenetic letter is given in the handbook *Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτῆρες* attributed to Pseudo-Libanius:⁵

Therefore, paraenetic style [παραινετική] is that through which we advise [παραινουμεν] someone, persuading [προτρεποντες] him to push on toward something or to get rid of something. Paraenesis is divided into two: persuasion [προτροπήν] and dissuasion [ἀποτροπήν]. Some also say this is deliberative style [συμβουλευτικήν], but not rightly, because paraenesis differs from deliberation. For paraenesis is paraenetic discourse [λόγος παραινετικός] that does not allow an opposing statement, such as if someone might say that it is necessary to honor the divinity; for no one opposes this paraenesis unless he were mad beforehand. But a deliberation [συμβουλή] is a deliberative discourse [λόγος συμβουλευτικός] that does allow an opposing statement, such as if someone might say that it is necessary to go to war, for there are many profitable things from war, and some other person might speak against, that it is not necessary to go to war, for there are many things that come to pass from war, such as defeat, captivity, wounds, and often destruction of a city.⁶

The handbook first tries to state what the paraenetic style *is*, by means of the verb παραινείν, which is, of course, using a word to define itself.⁷ However,

⁵ This source is variously dated from the fourth to the sixth centuries CE. My translation of the text is from Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, SBLSPS 19 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 66–81. Malherbe uses the edition of *Libanii Opera*, ed. R. Foerster (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927), vol. 9.

⁶ Παραινετική μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ δι' ἧς παραινουμεν τινι προτρεποντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴ ὀρμήσῃ ἢ καὶ ἀφέξεσθαι τινος. ἡ παραινέσις δὲ εἰς δύο διαιρεῖται, εἰς τε προτροπήν καὶ ἀποτροπήν. ταύτην δὲ τινες καὶ συμβουλευτικὴν εἶπον οὐκ εὖ, παραινέσις γὰρ συμβουλῆς διαφέρει. παραινέσις μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ λόγος παραινετικός ἀντίρρησιν οὐκ ἐπιδεχόμενος, οἷον ὡς εἰ τις εἴποι, ὅτι δεῖ τὸ θεῖον τιμᾶν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐναντιοῦται τῇ παραινέσει ταύτῃ μὴ πρότερον μανείς· συμβουλή δ' ἐστὶ λόγος συμβουλευτικός ἀντίρρησιν ἐπιδεχόμενος, οἷον ὡς εἰ τις εἴποι, ὅτι δεῖ πολεμεῖν, πολλὰ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ ἐκ πολέμου κέρδη, ἕτερος δὲ τις ἂν ἀντείποι, ὡς οὐ δεῖ πολεμεῖν, πολλὰ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ ἐκ πολέμου συμβαίνοντα, οἷον ἡττα, αἰχμαλωσία, πληγαί, πολλάκις καὶ πόλεως κατασκαφή, Ps.-Lib., *Epist.* 5. The paraenetic letter is the first among the forty-one types of epistolary styles described in the handbook; however, the handbook offers no further information on a “deliberative” style of letter. On the other hand, while omitting mention of a “paraenetic type” of letter, Ps.-Demetrius offers a sample of an “deliberative type” (συμβουλευτικός) that also uses the persuasion-dissuasion antithesis: “in offering our own judgment, we persuade toward something or dissuade from something,” ὅταν τὴν ἰδίαν γνώμην προφερόμενοι προτρέπωμεν ἐπὶ τὴ ἢ ἀποτρέπωμεν ἀπὸ τινος, *Ep.* 11. His example is that of a letter to a ruler, on how to gain the goodwill of his subjects.

⁷ Throughout the section on letter styles, Ps.-Lib. employs cognates as “definitions.” For example, in this paragraph, we also find “συμβουλευτικὴν ... συμβουλῆς.” By using a participle of προτρέπειν and the noun προτροπή to describe how paraenesis functions, Ps.-Lib. further confuses any distinctions between protreptic and paraenetic literature. As Mitchell states: “the ancient evidence is ambiguous and contradictory In antiquity, three terms, προτροπή, συμβουλή, and παραινέσις (even a fourth can be added, παράκλησις ...), despite attempts at regularization ..., were used to describe sometimes parallel, sometimes identical and often intersecting literary/rhetorical phenomena ...” (*Paul and the Rhetoric*, 51). Early on,

this author wants to clarify what paraenesis *is not*: it *is not* deliberation. He then provides a criterion for differentiation: paraenesis sets forth opinions and arguments that all sane people would agree with, while deliberation covers truly debatable issues.

In modern scholarship, paraenesis has been defined as “general moral exhortation which is of universal application”;⁸ the handbook’s examples demonstrate how this would be differentiated from deliberation: “worship of the gods” is one of those topics suitable for “general moral exhortation which is of universal application.” Conversely, deliberation consists of “rather specific situation-centered arguments for a person or a group of people to follow a particular course of action (often related to public policy),”⁹ such as whether or not to go to war based on the probable outcomes. Using these parameters, even though *Melissa to Kleareta* does not contain the terms *παραινείν* or *παραινέσις*, this letter sits on the paraenesis-side of the equation suggested by these definitions: it gives advice about women that anticipates no opposing statement and offers “general moral exhortation” that is thought to be universally applicable.

Since the content of any paraenetic text is thought to be “universal” (or, we might say, socially acceptable, or based on cultural conventions), the statements made do not require much “proof”; instead, they are believed to be self-evident. This is the case with most of the paraenesis given in *Melissa to Kleareta*, which articulates few reasons underlying the individual pieces of advice. In fact, only four such justifications are used: (a) a wife should only wear modest clothing because immodest clothing is worn by *hetairai*; (b) only her husband is entitled to see her body, because neighbor-men should not see her form; (c) she should not trust in looks and possessions, because jealousy and sickness diminish them; (d) she should trust in the beauty and wealth of her soul because they will last until death. The author states such justifications briefly and without sustained argument, as they too are considered to be patently obvious: the woman seeking virtue just needs to be *reminded* of all these proprieties, since she is surrounded daily by a total

Aristotle had connected deliberation with *προτροπή*, and allows for both a private and public context for the speech: “The deliberative is either persuasion or dissuasion, for always both those deliberating in private and those speaking in the public assembly do either of these,” Συμβουλῆς δὲ τὸ μὲν προτροπή τὸ δὲ ἀποτροπή· αἶψι γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἰδίᾳ συμβουλευόντες καὶ οἱ κοινῇ δημηγοροῦντες τούτων θάτερον ποιοῦσιν, *Rhet.* 1.3.3. See also Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary*, “Protreptic literature” and “Paraenesis.”

⁸ Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 53.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 52.

discourse (e.g., in texts, speeches, inscriptions, art, and personal examples) that conveys this socially-correct behavior.

Furthermore, such a paraenetic letter has a “friendly” tone because the sender and the recipient are portrayed as holding the same cultural (i.e., “universal”) view about the “decorous wife.”¹⁰ Here there is no need for “Melissa” to question, criticize, or re-direct any of “Kleareta’s” thoughts or actions: it is enough for her to “remind” the recipient of what she already knows. The “light touch” of paraenesis is outlined by Malherbe:

Paraenesis was a style of exhortation used to influence conduct rather than teach something new The stylistic devices used therefore sought to *confirm* the audience or readers in what they already knew by *reminding* them of it, *complimenting* them on what they had already accomplished and *encouraging* them to continue their practice, and offering models of virtue to be imitated.¹¹

Thus, in paraenetic letters, we do not find features like vocative addresses, rhetorical questions, strong warnings, and intense censures common to the diatribal style, many of which are present in letters of censure like *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate*.¹² Rather, the feeling of *Melissa to Kleareta* is positive and encouraging, since the author has “a good hope” (καλὰν ἐλπιδά) that Kleareta will arrive at a virtuous old age.

Many ancient letters identified as paraenetic are attributed to male senders who give moral-philosophical advice on a variety of matters.¹³

¹⁰ One letter with a similarly friendly tone is Παραμυθητικὸς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, Plutarch’s consolatory letter to his wife Timoxena on the death of their young daughter.

¹¹ Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*, 74; my italics. In another place, Malherbe phrases it this way: “Since what is advised is already known ..., the exhorter disavows the need for further instruction ..., but merely reminds his listeners of what they already know ...” (*Moral Exhortation*, 125). He includes excerpts from Ps.-Isocrates, *To Demoncus*; Seneca, *Epistles*; and NT citations, e.g., 1 Thess 4:9; 5:1; 2 Cor 9:1. Aune states: “Paraenesis is so familiar that it is often presented as a ‘reminder’ (Seneca, *Letters* 13.15; 94.21–25; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 17.2.5; 1 Thess. 4:1–2; 2 Thess. 3:6; Phil. 3:1)” (*The Westminster Dictionary*, “Paraenesis,” 334). See also Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 96.

¹² Such diatribal features are detailed in Stowers, *Diatribes and Paul’s Letter*, esp. 85–93, 119–122, 125–133, 138–147, 158–164, 168–171.

¹³ Aune lists Ps.-Isocrates, *Ad Demoncum*; Seneca, *Ep.* 6, 11, 13, 94, 95 (*The Westminster Dictionary*, s.v. “Paraenesis”). Fiore draws upon Ps.-Isocrates *Ad Nicoclem* and *Ad Demoncum* (although he calls these “discourses”) (*Function of Personal Example*, 45–67); as well as official letters that are “hortatory” (ibid., 79–84); and, of course, the Socratic letters, Ch.VI. Under “Letters of Exhortation and Advice,” Stowers discusses Cicero, *To Friends* 5 (although he says this is a mixed type), along with excerpts from papyrus letters (Esthladas to his father and mother; Ammonius to Apollonius; Aquila to Sarapion), from so-called “literary letters” (Seneca to Lucilius; Pliny to Avitus; Pliny to Maximus; Epicurus to his mother; Epicurus to

Therefore, the letters bear the marks of Greco-Roman *paideia*. As Fiore states of the Socratic Letters, "... the echoes of a rhetorical school which can be detected in the letters, together with their philosophical interest, suggest a school environment where both the art of rhetoric and the art of living were taught."¹⁴ The Pythagorean women's letters likewise emerged from such a pedagogical context, while embodying the characteristic notion that women too could be taught certain aspects of philosophy.¹⁵ The paraenetic style and instructional purpose of *Melissa to Kleareta* (along with the other Pythagorean women's letters) show that it is believed that paraenesis could come from and be addressed to women as well as men. This means that female learner-recipients are thought to be susceptible to the same "instructional methods" (here, paraenesis conveyed by means of a letter) used for male learner-recipients.

Menoceus; Anarcharsis to Croesus; Crates to Aper), and from the *Letter to Diognetus* (*Letter Writing*, ch. 10, 91–151). The author of this last letter commends Diognetus for being "very earnest," ὑπερσπουδαχότα, just as "Melissa" commends Kleareta for her "earnest wishing," ἐσπουδασμένως ἐθέλεν. Malherbe includes *Melissa to Kleareta* (*Moral Exhortation*, 83). Because he covers "moral exhortation," rather than paraenesis alone, Malherbe also translates *Theano to Euboule* as one of his epistolary "Means of Instruction" (*ibid.*, 83–85). In his brief discussion of these two letters, Malherbe does not make the important distinction between a paraenetic letter (*Melissa to Kleareta*) and a letter of censure (*Theano to Euboule*). See my analysis below of *Theano to Euboule*.

¹⁴ *The Function of Personal Example*, 109. Further on, Fiore states: "A school context of the letters, therefore, accounts for the mixture of the rhetorical and the philosophical in the corpus" (*ibid.*, 116).

¹⁵ An underused example of a woman who philosophized is found in the pseudonymous paraenetic letter purportedly sent by the Socratic Aristippus to his daughter Arete (*Ep.* 27): "Before all I enjoin you to care for little Aristippus, so that he might be worthy of us and of philosophy. For this is the real inheritance I leave behind for him. Concerning philosophy you have not written me that anyone has taken this away from you. Then, my good woman, rejoice greatly that you are enriched by the riches laid aside by you and make your son, whom I wished before was my own son, a possessor of this [wealth];" πρὸ παντὸς δὲ ἐπισκῆπτω σοι τοῦ μικροῦ Ἀριστίππου ἐπιμελείσθαι, ὅπως ἄξιός ἡμῶν καὶ φιλοσοφίας ταύτην γὰρ αὐτῷ καταλείπω τὴν ὄντως κληρονομίαν περὶ φιλοσοφίας δὲ οὐδὲ ἔν μοι γέγραφας, ὅτι ταύτην σοῦ τις ἀφῆρηται. μέγα οὖν, ὦ ἀγαθὴ γύναι, χαίρε ἐπὶ τῷ πλουτεῖν πλούτον τὸν ὑπὸ σοὶ κείμενον καὶ κτηματίτην ποιεῖ τούτου τὸν υἱόν, ὃν ἐβουλόμην μὲν αὐτὸς ἤδη ἐμὸν υἱὸν εἶναι. This example indicates that writers of such letters use the same rhetorical methods and instructional aims in order to address both men and women. The ongoing ancient philosophical and cultural debates about female nature—women's supposed distinctions as "the opposite sex," their weaker moral capacity, their lesser ability to control the passions, and their consequent need to develop *sôphrosynê*—show that one cannot simply assume that women would learn via the same teaching strategies applied to men.

Rhetorical Analysis of "Myia to Phyllis," a Paraenetic Letter

Like *Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis* is a brief, friendly letter written in a plain style, meant to encourage the recipient in her new life situation. For (approximately) the first half of the letter, the advice focuses on the qualifications for an appropriate wet-nurse; in the second half, the advice could be enacted by both the mother and the wet-nurse. Once again, the argumentation depends primarily upon appeals to cultural beliefs. For example, when "Myia" insists that a wet-nurse ought to be "well-disposed and clean, modest, and not predisposed toward sleep and or strong drink,"¹⁶ she justifies this with the commonsense statement: "for this is the kind of woman who might be judged best for raising free children."¹⁷ Twice the letter indicates that the health and welfare of the child is at stake (lines 12–13, 14–15). With respect to the infant's environment, the author draws on two different philosophical elements. The air in the house "ought to have an equal proportion [τὰν συμμετρίαν] of heat and cold."¹⁸ This is followed by an appeal to "nature" (φύσις) that sums up the reasons for maintaining "moderation" in infant care, particularly in feeding, bathing, and the household environment: "for in all these things, nature yearns for what suits it, but not what is extravagant" (lines 30–31).¹⁹ The general tenor of the counsel remains gentle and warm, framed as it is between the brief words of the opening and the promise to send further instructions appropriate to the child's maturity.

The logic of such an "argument" corresponds to the description of paraenesis. There are no censures of Phyllis' behavior nor other intense rhetorical features of the diatribal style. Instead, the paraenetic epistolary genre is clearly signaled here by the use of the verb παρανεῖν in the opening line: "Now that you have become a mother of children, I *advise* you as follows" (γενομένην τοι ματέρι παίδων τάδε παρανέω). That the author believes that the paraenesis offered "does not allow an opposing statement"²⁰ (Ps.-Lib.,

¹⁶ τὰν ἐπιταδαιοτάταν καὶ καθάριον, ἔτι δὲ αἰδήμονα καὶ μὴ ὕπνῳ προσοικειουμένην μηδὲ μὴν μέθῃ, lines 3–4.

¹⁷ ἂ τοιάδε γὰρ ἂν κρίνοιτο κρατίστα ποττὸ ἐκτρέφειν ἐλευθέρως παῖδας lines 4–6.

¹⁸ θάλλπους καὶ ῥίγους ἔχων τὰν συμμετρίαν, lines 26–27.

¹⁹ It is somewhat unclear how far back the reader ought to go to find the antecedent of "all these things." Certainly the term τὸ οἰκεῖον echoes the οἰκησις advised in regard to the taste of water, but ensuring a "proportion" (τὰν συμμετρίαν, line 27) of hot and cold air in the house, as well as "temperate" (εὐκράτων) baths also convey the idea of suitability. Giving the infant "most simple" (ἁπλουστάταν, line 22) sustenance could be seen as a practice opposite to "what is extravagant" (τὸ πολυτελές, line 31).

²⁰ This author makes the assumption that hiring a wet-nurse is a commonly-accepted

*Epist.*5) and, in fact, is already well-known to the recipient, is seen in her closing sentence: “But, with God’s help, we will again convey *approved and suitable reminders* concerning the raising of the child.”²¹ That these reminders are described as “approved and suitable” indicates the author’s belief in the social acceptability of this advice.

One significant feature of this letter is the description of the credentials of a good wet-nurse, which are structured as antitheses of qualifications and disqualifications.²² The first two pairs place the “positive” virtue first and the “negative” vice second, followed by a general statement of the wet-nurse’s attitude on the job: “For this is the kind of woman who might be judged best for raising free children—if, that is, she has nutritious milk and is not an easy conquest for bedding down with a man. A great help in this is that for her whole life she is first and primarily directed to their upbringing by nursing them well.” Perhaps in order to emphasize the positive qualities, the four latter antithetical pairs use the reverse sequence. I have re-arranged these for easier categorization.²³ This woman ought to be:

Table B: Qualifications for a wet-nurse

A: Qualifications	B: Disqualifications
most well-disposed and clean, and what is more, modest ἐπιταδαιοτάταν καὶ καθάριον, ἔτι δὲ αἰδήμονα	and not predisposed to sleep nor indeed to strong drink καὶ μὴ ὑπνῶ προσοικειουμέναν μὴδὲ μὴν μέθα
if that is, she has nutritious milk ἐάν γε δὴ γάλα τρόφιμον ἔχη	and is not an easy conquest when it comes to bedding with men καὶ μὴ ταῖς πρὸς ἄνδρα κοίταις εὐνίκατος πέλη
Offer nourishment: with some forethought μετά τινος προνοίας	not whenever it comes to mind μὴ καττὸ ἐπενθόν

procedure. However, other ancient writers contest the practice, as explained in Chapter Four under “*Subject Matter: Myia to Phyllis*.”

²¹ θεῶ δὲ συλλαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῷ παιδὸς αὐτοῖς τὰς ἐνδεχομένας καὶ ποτεοικίας κομιοῦμες ὑπομνάσεις, lines 33–35.

²² These short lists are similar to the qualifications outlined for office-holders and others in the Pastorals, as I discuss in Chapter Seven.

²³ Another syntactical difference is that the first two are joined with the conjunction καὶ while the latter four strike a more determined opposition with the use of ἀλλά.

A: Qualifications	B: Disqualifications
[Offer nourishment]: whenever the newborn has a desire of rest ἀλλ' ὅποτε ἂν τὸ νεογνὸν ἀναπαύσιος ἔρον ἔχοι	not whenever she herself wishes to sleep μὴ ὅτε αὐτὰ θέλοι καθεύδεν νικῆται
let her be orderly and <i>sōphrōn</i> τεταγμένα καὶ σώφρων	let a nurse never be inclined to anger nor talkative nor indifferent in the selection of foodstuffs ἔστω δε μήτ' ὀργίλα τιθάνα μήτε πρόγλωσσος μήτε ἐν ταῖς τῶν σιτίων λήψεσιν ἀδιάφορος
[let her be] a Greek Ἑλληνίς	let her not be a barbarian ὄντων μὴ βάρβαρος

These antitheses of virtues and vices serve as a character sketch of as well as a quasi-job description for the good wet-nurse. The rhetorical use of such antitheses is related to the *logos protreptikos*, with its dual tactics of “exposing the errors of alternate ways of living and demonstrating the truth claims of a particular philosophical tradition over its competitors.”²⁴ Such rhetorical antitheses sharpen the perceived division between the two possible choices for action, with descriptions of the vices being employed to emphasize the absolute wrong of one thing while at the same time reinforcing the superiority of the “good.”²⁵ The negative descriptors are clearly rooted in cultural stereotypes, developed further into a caricature that is meant to evoke an emotional response from the reader²⁶ so that the glaring female antitype

²⁴ Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary*, “Protreptic literature,” 383. As Stowers points out, the method of contrasting persuasive and dissuasive elements later influenced diatribal texts: “Normally, the diatribe is not structured so that it contains major, uniform blocks of discourse in the argumentation such as treatments of reasons for and reasons against the thesis. Instead, because of the indictment-protreptic mode, *positive and negative treatments* of the thesis tend to interact and *alternate* through the diatribe” (*The Diatribe and Paul's Letter*, 145; my italics). What is true for diatribal texts also pertains to paraenetic ones (as seen in Ps.-Libanius’ claim that “paraenesis is divided into two, into persuasion and dissuasion”), because of their common origins in philosophical schools and the influence of rhetorical training on their authors.

²⁵ In addition, this indicates the general assumption about human anthropology/psychology/capacity for moral action: that a person can *choose* the good. Ironically, in *Myia to Phyllis*, the new mother can *literally* choose (ἐκλέξασθαι) the good wet-nurse.

²⁶ My conclusion is partly based on Heinrich Lausberg’s definition of the caricature as “a partisan ... *characterismus* disregarding the *aptum* with truth and greatly stretching credibility (*verisimile*) (thereby serving the party-favorable *delectatio* ...)” (*Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* [trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen,

deters an elite woman from hiring this immoral woman to nurse a tender freeborn infant.

Overall, the instructional methods adapted to an epistolary form, *Myia to Phyllis* uses rhetorical strategies similar to those found in letters attributed to male authors. Its paraenesis comes in a philophrhetic letter written in a plain style, while the application of antithetical virtues and vices indicates that the author thought that women, too, could plausibly compose and understand and respond to this form of persuasion and dissuasion.

THE LETTER COLLECTION TH3:
THEANO TO EUBOULE, THEANO TO NIKOSTRATE,
AND THEANO TO KALLISTO

Rhetorical Analysis of “Theano to Euboule,” a Letter of Censure

In *Theano to Euboule*, the presumed epistolary occasion—that of a mother who is spoiling her children—leads directly into a thesis statement: “the characteristic of a good mother is not care for the pleasure of her children, but rather guidance to the moderate [way of life.]”²⁷ The rest of the letter argues this proposition by means of emotionally-intense examples, warnings, and promises. Although “Euboule” is the recipient of the instructions and her actions are sometimes critiqued, the author relies on descriptions of both the present and future behavior of her children to motivate this mother toward more virtuous childrearing. The spoiled children represent direct extensions of the mother’s own lack of *sōphrosynē*. This is clear from the most potent example, in which both mother and children are indicted: “But you are nursing your children like the offspring of Sardanapallos, emasculating the males’ nature by pleasures.”²⁸ The letter proceeds by painting such evocative (and mostly negative) portraits, ending with a warning that a mother may indeed “spoil” her children just like a cultivator who has not attended to the development of her vines.

David E. Orton; eds. David E. Orton & R. Dean Anderson; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 853). Lausberg describes the *delectare* appeal to *pathos* as: “The sympathy of the audience for the speaker and the speech topic is won by means of an emotional bridge, in relation to the subject, between the speaker and the audience” (ibid., 114).

²⁷ ἔστι δὲ ἀγαθῆς μητρὸς οὐχ ἡ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐπιμέλεια τῶν παίδων, ἀλλ’ ἡ πρὸς τὸ σώφρον ἀγωγή, lines 2–4.

²⁸ σὺ δ’ οἷον Σαρδαναπάλλου γονὴν τιθνήῃ τὰ τέκνα, τὴν τῶν ἀρρένων φύσιν θρύπτουσα ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, lines 24–25.

Theano to Euboule takes the form of a letter of censure, an epistolary type found in both Pseudo-Demetrius' Τύποι Ἐπιστολικοί and Pseudo-Libanius' Ἐπιστολικάιοι Χαρακτήρες. The former says "The censorious type [ἐπιτιμητικός] is that which is written with rebukes for sins that have been done."²⁹ The latter states briefly: "The censorious style [ἐπιτιμητική] [is that] through which we censure [ἐπιτιμῶμεν] someone for the things he did ignobly."³⁰ One element in *Theano to Euboule* is consonant with this category, and that is the verb "to censure" (ἐπιτιμάω, used in lines 28 and 38). Although in both instances the author is referring to Euboule's *child* learning to accept censure, the author implicitly extends this activity to Euboule herself, with the aim that she will accept the censure contained in the letter.

Furthermore, Ps.-Demetrius gives an example of a censorious letter, which states, in part: "But the offense that has happened still is able to be remedied, for if you train [yourself]³¹ toward correction, you yourself will be responsible for it not happening as it happened before."³² This sample censorious letter discusses proper "training" of oneself as *Theano to Euboule* looks to a mother's training of her children.³³ Both letters look to the future by making the recipient responsible for correcting their behavior in order to ensure that the "ignoble" things will not happen again.³⁴ For Ps.-Demetrius, this expectation that past behavior can be corrected in the future seems to separate the "censorious type" (ἐπιτιμητικός) apart from the "admonishing type" (νουθετητικός, 7) and other epistolary types that involve critiquing the recipients' actions ("blaming" [μεμτικός, 3]; "reproachful" [ὀνειδιστικός, 4]; "threatening" [ἀπειλητικός, 8]; "vituperative" [ψεκτικός, 9]; and "accusing" [κατηγορικός, 17]).³⁵ Of the samples of various letters given in the handbook,

²⁹ Ἐπιτιμητικός δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἐφ' ἀμαρτήμασι προγεγονόσι μετ' ἐπιπλήξεως γραφόμενος (*Typoi Ep.* 6).

³⁰ ἐπιτιμητική δι' ἧς ἐπιτιμῶμεν τινι ἐφ' οἷς ἀσέμνως πράττει (*Ep.* 34).

³¹ LSJ, s.v. ἄγω, II.5.

³² ἀλλ' ἔτι γε δυνατόν ἐστιν ἰάσεως τυχεῖν τὸ γεγονός πλημμέλημα. πρὸς διόρθωσιν γὰρ ἀγαγὼν αὐτὸς αἴτιος γενήσῃ τοῦ μὴ γεγονέναι καθάπερ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ γεγονέναι (*Typoi Ep.* 6).

³³ ἀγαγὼν is used in Ps.-Demetr., and the noun ἀγωγή in *Theano to Euboule* (line 4).

³⁴ As with paraenetic letters, the future outlook signals the censorious letter's proximity to deliberative rhetoric.

³⁵ The English translations are from *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, trans. by Malherbe (33–39). The situation in Ps-Libanius is similar: of the equivalent letter types, only the "letter of censure" calls for a change in action. "The censorious style. Then be ashamed for what you have sinned, and stop offending and do not make your life an exercise of failures. For on account of you we are shamed," Ἐπιτιμητική. Αἰδέσθητι λοιπὸν ἐφ' οἷς ἀμαρτάνεις καὶ παῦσαι τοῦ πλημμελεῖν καὶ μὴ μελέτην ἀμαρτημάτων τὸν σὸν βίον. σοῦ γὰρ ἔνεκεν ἡμεῖς αἰσχυρόμεθα, *Ep.* 81. Note that both Ps. Demetrius and Ps.-Libanius use cognates of ἀμαρτ- and of πλημμελ- in describing letters of censure.

it is only the “censorious type” that explicitly advises the recipient to change their future behavior.

The tone and literary style of a “censorious letter” differ from those of a paraenetic letter like *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, with their friendly attitude and reminders of commonly-held beliefs. Here instead the epistolary occasion posits that Euboule’s method of mothering has already wrongly deviated from certain cultural expectations, so that both she and her children require a course correction. Because Euboule is depicted by the author as needing serious intervention, this letter contains some elements that are more characteristic of what is known as the “diatribal style.”³⁶ In *written* compositions, this style draws upon the dialectical teaching methods common to the *oral* discourses of philosophical schools in that the authors use *censure* to expose “contradiction, error, and ignorance,” combined with positively framed calls “to the philosophic life by describing and illustrating virtue.”³⁷ The diatribal style is therefore closely linked to an instructional purpose, whether it appears in a school dialectic or a philosophical letter.³⁸ In form, any diatribal text is similar to the letter-genre itself in that both communicate via a simulated (half-) dialogue involving an “I” (a teacher, author, or sender in the first person) and a “you” (student, reader, or recipient in the second person).³⁹ Another feature of diatribal texts is the presence of

³⁶ I base my description of diatribal style on Aune’s definition that “Diatribē is a modern literary term describing an informal rhetorical mode of argumentation principally characterized by a lively dialogical style ...” (*The Westminster Dictionary*, “Diatribē,” 127–129). With Aune, I also rely on Stowers’ careful delineation of the elements of diatribal texts, *The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter*; see n. 12 above.

³⁷ Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary*, 128. Diatribal texts were originally “records of oral classroom discussions and discourses of philosophical schools where the teacher used the Socratic methods of ‘censure’ (ἐλεγκτικός) and ‘persuasion’ (προτροπτικός)” (ibid.).

³⁸ Stowers identifies three characteristics of ancient diatribal literature: (1) “their common appropriation of a certain body of popular philosophical traditions”; (2) “their use of a dialogical style together with certain other stylistic or rhetorical features”; and (3) “the scholastic social setting” (*The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter*, 48–49). Although the first and third of Stowers’ suppositions are absolutely germane to my argument (that is, they corroborate the content and transmission of philosophical traditions, and the educational setting and purposes of these letters), at this point I concentrate on the second of his aspects: the diatribal style.

³⁹ Of Stowers’ eight philosophical sources, it is his analysis of the letters of Seneca that sheds the most light on the style of the letters at hand, precisely because Seneca’s diatribal style occurs within the form of letters, which makes it appropriate for Stowers’ investigation of the letter to the Romans: “Seneca’s popular philosophical writings include his *epistulae morales*, the so-called *dialogi* and other moral essays. The special concern here, however, will be with Seneca’s epistles since, as in Paul’s letter to the Romans, *the style of the diatribe is combined with the form of a letter*” (*The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter*, 70; my italics). For

strong antithetical pairings used as justifications for the author's reasoning. One function of such antitheses in letters is to replicate the instructional methods of dissuading and persuading; thus they call to mind the context of philosophical education. In my analysis of the antitheses used here,⁴⁰ the negative sides usually receive more detailed description than the positive and are probably designed to elicit a "horrified" response from the reader that will steer her away from wrong thinking and bad behavior.⁴¹ While the use of antithetical argumentation is not restricted to censorious letters, this diatribal element is particularly well-suited to the authorial purpose in composing letters such as *Theano to Euboule*.⁴²

From among the diatribal elements delineated by Stowers, there are five that appear to me to be most prominent⁴³ in the letters of Theano: (1) the

his analysis of letters and diatribe, Stowers draws upon the work of Hildegard Cancik [now, Cancik-Lindemaier] (ibid., 69–75). Stowers states: "Cancik shows that the letter was precisely the suitable form for the expression of Seneca's philosophy. Central to Seneca's concept of the philosophical life is the struggle and participation with a friend toward common philosophical goals. Cancik shows that Seneca provides Lucilius with a type of *epistolary paraenesis* where he acts as spiritual guide and presents Lucilius with his own example through the letter" (ibid., 70; my italics). Stowers eventually asks: "How does one distinguish between the dialogical element of the letter and the dialogical style of the diatribe? Above all, the dialogical aspect of the letter displays itself within the context of the letter's philophroneic character. Stylistically, this results in the tone of two friends holding a conversation. Even when a rebuke is called for, it is qualified by this friendship. The dialogical element of the diatribe, on the other hand, tends to be less personal, with the author using the methods of indictment-protreptic and the subject matter is moral-philosophical" (ibid., 71). Yet, for all the friendliness in Seneca's letter to Lucilius, Stowers still finds that "The relationship between Seneca and Lucilius ... goes beyond a simple friendship. It is also a student-teacher relationship. Seneca frequently shifts from the simple friendly tone of the letter to the didactic style of the diatribe with its method of indictment and protreptic" (ibid.). Thus, a censorious letter like *Theano to Euboule* can still hypothesize a friendship (however strained) between author and recipient, which is supported by "Theano" repeatedly calling "Euboule" φίλή (lines 6–7, 32, 38, and 41).

⁴⁰ Of course, the use of antitheses is not limited to the diatribal style, as can be seen in my analysis of *Myia to Phyllis*.

⁴¹ See n. 26 for Lausberg's notion of the use of caricature as an appeal to *pathos*.

⁴² This also holds true for the next letter in the collection, *Theano to Nikostrate*.

⁴³ The typical diatribal "address to an imaginary interlocutor," and the sometimes resulting formulating of possible "objections" to the author's thoughts, do not occur in the Pythagorean letters. Stowers discusses the imaginary interlocutor in *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter*, ch. 2, and objections in ch. 3. This interlocutor is addressed by a neutral vocative, such as: ὦ ἄνθρωπε (o man) or ὦ ἑταῖρε (o friend) or even τις (someone, anyone), so that, as Stowers concludes: "The fictitious objector is often anonymous, colorless and almost without any identity ..." (ibid., 129). Says Stowers, "The forms of address include: ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ὦ ἑταῖρε, ὦ μωρέ, Ἐπίκουρε, ὦ κακώδαιμω, ὦ καταγέλαστε, ὦ σχέτλιοι, ὦ τετυφωμένε, ὦ κενοί φρενῶν, ὦ τῆς πλεονεξίας, ὦ πονηρέ, ἄφρων, τάλας, ταλαίπωρε, ὦ γενναῖε, ἀνδράποδο, ἀσεβέστατε, ὦ θαυμάσιοι, ὦ κενέ, *infelix, miser, stulte*. A variety of attitudes and degrees of friendliness or severity is

use of second person singular address; (2) indicting statements and rhetorical questions; and three antithetical pairings: (3) warnings of negative consequences and promises of good outcomes; (4) inventories of vices and virtues;⁴⁴ and (5) the use of moral and immoral examples.⁴⁵

(1) The use of *second person singular addresses* is the strongest linguistic link among the three letters of Theano.⁴⁶ This is exhibited most often in “Theano’s” characteristic use of the vocative φίλη, which appears thirteen times in the three letters.⁴⁷ The recipient is usually addressed in the second singular, σὺ/σε, which again is not surprising, since these are letters purportedly sent to a single recipient.⁴⁸ However, in *Theano to Euboule* this address may be quite abrupt, almost fulfilling Stowers’ description of an author “suddenly” turning to address the purported objector.⁴⁹ For example, after making a general statement that children in poor families thrive even in harsh circumstances, Theano all at once pounces on Euboule with “But you are nursing your children like the offspring of Sardanapallos.”⁵⁰

obvious” (ibid., 85). He continues: “Objections seem to arise from the author’s argumentation and attempt to persuade or arise from concern for special emphasis rather than as part of a polemic against an individual or collective opponent” (ibid., 129).

⁴⁴ These antitheses of personal virtues and vices are not at all concerned, as is Aristotle, with finding the virtuous “mean” between two extreme vices (*Nic. Eth.* 1106b–110a).

⁴⁵ This fifth feature, the use of moral examples, is significant to my project in a few ways (e.g., with respect to pseudonymous author-teachers as exemplars), but here I restrict my comments to the rhetorical function of explicit examples.

⁴⁶ *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis* employ no vocatives; just a few second-person pronouns (*Melissa* with none; *Myia* with τοι [lines 2, 32]), along with only two second-person singular verbs which convey the “reality” of a recipient (e.g., *Melissa*: μέλλεις [line 5] and ἔχεις [line 15]; *Myia*: none). The only bit of urgency in these letters comes in the expression οὐ μὲν ἀλλά (*Myia*, line 28). In both of these letters, the stated recipient fades into the background as the authors rely upon a generic “she” who represents the ideal behavior of a wife. *Melissa to Kleareta* has: γυνή (lines 3, 11, 22), described via the substantive adjectives τὰν σὺφφρονα καὶ ἐλευθέραν (line 5, with ἐλευθέραν repeated in line 13). *Myia to Phyllis* discusses in the third-person a wet-nurse (τίτθαν [lines 2, 15]), who ought to be τὰν ἐπιταδαιοτάταν καὶ καθάριον (line 3). Both letters indicate that they are discussing virtuous behavior for *women* by the use of feminine participles like κεκαλλωπισμένην (*Melissa*, line 6), εὐαρεστούσας γυναικὸς (*Melissa*, line 11), τὰν γλχιζομένην (*Melissa* line 18), and μὴ ὕπνῳ προσοικειομένην (*Myia* line 4).

⁴⁷ The word appears four times in *Theano to Euboule* (lines 6–7, 32, 38, and 41), twice introduced with the vocative ὦ; it also occurs six times in *Theano to Nikostrata* (lines 3, 7, 12, 30, 36, and 62), twice with ὦ; and three times in *Theano to Kallisto* (lines 9, 32, and 40), each with ὦ. In none of these cases is an attributive participle added to the vocative as is common with the vocatives identified by Stowers in other diatribal texts.

⁴⁸ The pronoun occurs three times in the letter *Theano to Euboule* (lines 2, 19, and 24) where it takes the emphatic form σὺ δ’.

⁴⁹ *The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter*, 86.

⁵⁰ For further discussion of Sardanapallos, see the section below on examples.

(2) *Indictments* are undoubtedly characteristic of the diatribal style.⁵¹ Stowers demonstrates that closely following a second-person address in a diatribal text, “the sentence which begins the address is either (a) an indicting rhetorical question, (b) an indicting statement, or (c) an imperative.”⁵² Indeed, *Theano to Euboule* uses all three of these options, all within the first paragraph. The letter begins with an *indicting statement*, “I hear you are raising your children in luxury,” along with a correction of the wrong behavior, “but the characteristic of a good mother is not care for the pleasure of her children, but rather guidance to the moderate [*sōphrōn*] [way of life].”⁵³ This is followed by an *imperative* “Watch out” (βλέπε), which expands into another indictment (“lest you do the work not of a loving mother, but of a flattering one, for when pleasure is brought up together with children it makes them intemperate”).⁵⁴ The thought is rounded out by an *indicting rhetorical question*: “For what is more pleasant to the young than customary pleasure?”⁵⁵ The author’s “answer” to this series of *indictment-imperative-question* is framed as a negative instruction, with a common knowledge sort of proof:

Therefore, my dear, the nurture of children must have no distortion. Nurture is a distortion of nature when, loving pleasure in their souls, they live pleasurably in their bodies, and when shunning hardship in the former, they become softer in the latter.⁵⁶

⁵¹ *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter*, 88. In contrast to such intense diatribal features, “reminders” are more characteristic of a paraenetic style. Therefore, one would not expect a paraenetic letter like *Melissa to Kleareta* to contain many indictments of the recipients’ actions or thoughts; see n. 5 above. Instead, the few indictments are directed toward other, unnamed, women. In *Melissa to Kleareta*, there is a censure of the clothing and behavior of *hetairai* (lines 10–11). Similarly, *Theano to Kallisto* indicts the behavior of “some women,” household-mistresses who mistreat their slaves (lines 14–15, and 32–35). The indictments of the *hetairai* and the “some women” are closely related to the moral examples which, in these cases, provide models *not* to be followed by the recipients.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 87.

⁵³ Ἀκούω σε τὰ παῖδια τρυφερῶς ἄγειν· ἔστι δὲ ἀγαθῆς μητρὸς οὐχ ἡ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐπιμέλεια τῶν παιδῶν, ἀλλ’ ἡ πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον ἀγωγή, lines 2–4. Note that the verb here is in the indicative, and that there is some contrast suggested between the two nominatives and their direct objects: ἡ ἐπιμέλεια (πρὸς ἡδονὴν) and ἡ ἀγωγή (πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον).

⁵⁴ βλέπε οὖν μὴ οὐ φιλούσης ἀλλὰ κολακευούσης ἔργον ποιήσης· συντρεφομένη γὰρ ἡδονὴ παισὶν ἀκολάστους ποιεῖ, lines 4–6. See below under “moral and immoral examples” for my analysis of the antithesis of the loving and flattering mothers.

⁵⁵ τί γὰρ ἡδίων νέοις συνήθους ἡδονῆς; line 6. While this is not a clear second-person address to “Phyllis”; yet as the recipient of the letter, the author constructs her as on the receiving end of this question as well.

⁵⁶ χρὴ οὖν, ὦ φίλη, τὴν τροφὴν τῶν παιδῶν μὴ διαστροφὴν ἔχειν. ἡ δὲ τρυφή διαστροφή τῆς φύσεώς ἐστιν ὅταν φιλήδονοι μὲν ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ἡδυπαθεῖς δὲ τοῖς σώμασι γένωνται, καὶ ταῖς μὲν

Euboule is further censured for a range of behaviors:

Nor must one make them fond of gorging their food, or extravagant in pleasures, or intemperate in their childish play without constraint, that is, by permitting them to say anything or pursue anything, and besides you are fearful if they cry, and feel honored if they laugh, and laugh if they strike the nurse and if they speak ill of you, and by providing cold during the summer, and heat during the winter, and much delicacy.⁵⁷

In this letter, as in many other texts about childrearing from antiquity to the present, the mother is blamed for allowing or even encouraging the bad behavior of her children. Theano's indictment of Euboule's actions is quite thorough and unrelentingly negative, beginning with the first statement about raising children in luxury.

However, in this letter there are two targets for Theano's indictment: Euboule *and* her children, since the censure of both arises in a lengthy *rhetorical question*. Stowers describes the use of "expressions implying a lack of perception on the interlocutor's part," and rhetorical questions that "highlight the wrong opinions or erroneous logic of the opponent by employing a verb of thinking."⁵⁸ In *Theano to Euboule* there is one rhetorical question that exemplifies his description:

For what would someone make of a child, who if he does not eat right away, cries for food; and if he eats, he searches for the choicest delicacies; and if he is hot, is weakened, and if cold, acts like a corpse; and if someone censures, he fights against it; and if someone does not serve at his pleasure, he is grieved; and if he is not contemptuous, he is bad-tempered, and he is mischievous for pleasure, and goes around wriggling?⁵⁹

φυγοπόνοι, τοῖς δὲ μαλακώτεροι, lines 6–10. Stowers discusses the functions of such indictments: "Indictment exposes contradictions, error and ignorance. It describes and illustrates particular vices which are reflections of this ignorance and error" (*The Diatribe and Paul's Letter*, 106).

⁵⁷ οὐδὲ πλησμονικὰ μὲν ταῖς τροφαῖς, πολυτελὴ δὲ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, ἀκόλαστα δὲ ταῖς ἀνέδην παιδιαῖς αὐτὰ ποιεῖν, καὶ πᾶν μὲν λέγειν πᾶν δ' ἐπιτηδεύειν ἔασαι, ἔτι δὲ φοβουμένην μὲν, ἣν κλάη, φιλοτιμουμένην δέ, ἣν γελᾷ, καὶ τὴν τροφὸν παῖα καὶ σε κακῶς εἶπη γελῶσαν, καὶ τοῦ μὲν θέρους ψυχός, τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος καύμα παρέχουσαν καὶ πολλὴν χλιδὴν· ὧν οἱ πενιχροὶ γε παῖδες οὐδενός πειρώνται, καὶ τρέφονται μὲν ῥᾶον, αὐξονται δὲ οὐχ ἥσσον, διάκεινται δὲ παρὰ πολὺ κρεῖσσον, lines 15–23.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 89. Stowers concludes that a diatribal text sometimes includes "one or a series of rhetorical questions in an indicting or didactic tone ..." (ibid., 88). In the more clearly paraenetic letters (*Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis*, and *Theano to Kallisto*), there are no rhetorical questions.

⁵⁹ τί γάρ ἂν ποιήσειέ τις παιδίον, ὃ ἂν μὴ τάχιον φάγη κλάει, καὶ ἐσθίῃ, τὰ τερπνὰ τῶν ὄψων ζητεῖ, καὶ καύμα ᾗ, παρίεται, καὶ ψυχός πτωματίζει, καὶ ἐπιτιμᾷ τις, ἀντιμάχεται, καὶ μὴ

With the verb ποιεῖν acting as a “verb of thinking,” this elongated question certainly implies a “lack of perception” on Euboule’s part: she does not truly understand how others see her child’s behavior, so her reasoning on the subject of childrearing is wrong-headed. In this way, Euboule’s erroneous thinking and mistakes in mothering are quickly and specifically underscored, in order that she might be dissuaded from them and instead be persuaded to adopt in their place new and correct childrearing strategies. Furthermore, although the question begins with a non-specific “child” (παῖδιον), the strong implication exists that “Theano” is identifying and indicting the behavior of “Euboule’s” child(ren).

Both *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate* contain the indictments and rhetorical questions common to the diatribal style. This is because the author is unyielding in the goal of changing supposed “bad” behavior on the part of each addressee. The authorial assumption is that a mother who is flattering (and thus spoiling) her children and a wife who is sick with jealousy over her husband’s sexual betrayal are in need of immediate and decisive correction.⁶⁰ For this reason, the tone of the letters becomes more urgent by addressing the recipient more frequently and in an emphatic fashion. These letters also seem more “individual,” that is, more focused on the particular (fictional) situation of the (fictional) recipient, as if the author has actual inside information about the day-to-day lives of Euboule and Nikostrate. The details of Euboule’s and Nikostrate’s circumstances are given in the forms of indicting statements and rhetorical questions which are characteristic of diatribal texts, as well as within philosophical discourse, whether verbal or written.⁶¹

πρὸς ἡδονὴν ὑπηρετῇ, λυπεῖται, ἂν μὴ μασᾶται δυσκολαίνει, καὶ κακοσχολεῖ πρὸς ἡδονὴν καὶ βατταλίζεται περιηγόμενον; lines 25–31.

⁶⁰ Although the stated occasions for *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate* might initially be seen as more particular than the general occasions found in the other letters (all three of which reflect socially-accepted stages in a woman’s life: marriage, childbearing, household management), this does not mean that the censorious letters are less likely to be pseudepigraphical. What has happened to Euboule and Nikostrate is not “supposed” to have happened; their circumstances are far from the ideal, and they have not responded well to their situations. Nevertheless, the topics of bad childrearing and extramarital sexual relationships are covered by other ancient authors, so that such events must have occurred, even if they were not desirable.

⁶¹ As Stowers asserts, the goal of philosophical indictment “is not an aspect of real inquiry, but an attempt to expose specific errors in thought and behavior so that the student can be led to another doctrine of life” (*The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter*, 75). For more on diatribal rebuke, see *ibid.*, 48–78.

(3) All three letters ascribed to Theano offer *warnings and promises*⁶² which anticipate the consequences of human actions and which serve to concretize the “stick or the carrot” (dissuasion-persuasion) rhetorical approach. In the supposed situation of *Theano to Euboule*, the warnings are given to the mother but they consist in what will be exhibited in her children’s future behavior:

- they will become intemperate (ἀκολάστους, line 5);
- delight themselves in their bodies (ἡδυπαθεῖς δὲ τοῖς σώμασι γένωνται, line 9);
- become softer [in their bodies] (τοῖς δὲ μαλακώτεροι, line 10);
- become slaves to these emotions (τῶν παθῶν ἦ δοῦλα τούτων, lines 12–13);
- be gluttonous for pleasure, and apprehensive about pain (περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς λίχνα καὶ περὶ τοὺς πόνους ὀκνηρά, lines 13–14);
- have an enfeebled masculine nature (τὴν τῶν ἀρρένων φύσιν θρύπτουσα, lines 24–25);
- become slaves when grown men (ὅταν ἀκμάσῃ πρὸς ἀνδρας, ἀνδράποδα γίνεταί, line 33);
- produce poor fruit: “evil of outrage and much worthlessness” (ὑβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ἀχρεϊότητος κακίαν γεννήσωσιν, lines 42–43).

The point is that if Euboule changes her thoughts and methods of nurturing, the children will change also and a happier future will result: the children “might honor noble things above all else” (τὰ καλὰ πρὸ πάντων τιμῶσιν, line 14), which is defined as “being noble throughout the soul ..., whether they are lifted up or censured” (γεννικὰ εἶναι ... κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀνατεινόμενα ἢ ἐπιτιμώμενα, lines 37–38).⁶³ All of these consequences—good and bad—are considered to be the direct result of the mother’s parenting of her children. The small, pleasurable indulgences that the flattering mother gives to her children each day, such as protecting them from harsh environments, will produce larger immoral outcomes at their maturity. What may seem cute, endearing, or humorous in a child is not to be tolerated in an adult. The warnings and promises to the mother—whether she flatters or loves her young child—are oriented toward the future prospects for her grown up child.⁶⁴

⁶² I use “warnings” to indicate the negative impact of immoral behavior, and “promises” for the presumably better outcomes of good behavior. In both cases, Theano’s supposed experience as an older woman allows her to perceive future results.

⁶³ This is the same way Euboule herself ought to respond to the rebuke of Theano.

⁶⁴ This future-orientation again suggests the future “time” of deliberative rhetoric.

(4) A second antithetical pairing typical of instructional argumentation is the use of *virtues and vices*.⁶⁵ Of the four sets of vices in *Theano to Euboule*, only the first mentions any corresponding virtues (which, of course, may be assumed); throughout the letter there is much more emphasis on censure of the vices. Contrarily, the virtues to be encouraged are described in general terms as, for example, when the mother's job is to provide "guidance toward the moderate [way of life]" (lines 3–4), while the children "might honor the noble things above all else" (line 14).

The first inventory of virtues and vices is provided as part of the warnings and promises of good childrearing:

they might not be slaves of these emotions nor gluttonous for pleasure nor apprehensive about pain, but so that they might honor noble things above all else, abstaining from the former, while remaining constant in the latter.⁶⁶

Here "Theano" links "emotions" with pleasure-seeking and pain-avoiding, a theme stressed throughout the letter.⁶⁷

The second set, containing only vices, includes three things that Euboule ought to inhibit in her children:

Nor must one make them fond of gorging their food, or extravagant in pleasures, or intemperate in their childish play without constraint, that is, by permitting them to say anything or pursue anything.⁶⁸

Again, the description gives enough details to emphasize the wrongness of such behavior.

⁶⁵ Unlike the list-form of virtues and vices in the two paraenetic letters *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, the virtues and vices in *Theano to Euboule* appear in longer forms, with more description of how they are manifested by Euboule or her children.

⁶⁶ ἵνα μὴ τῶν παθῶν ἢ δοῦλα τούτων καὶ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς λίχνα καὶ περὶ τοὺς πόνους ὀκνηρά, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὰ καλὰ πρὸ πάντων τιμῶσιν, ὧν μὲν ἀπεχόμενοι, τοῖς δὲ ἐμμένοντες, lines 12–15. The negated subjunctive phrase, ἵνα μὴ τῶν παθῶν ἢ δοῦλα, echoes the requirement for older women in Titus 2:3; μὴδὲ οἷνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας. Städele supplies other references to the idea of being enslaved to the emotions (*Die Briefe*, 294).

⁶⁷ This issue is raised already in the first paragraph, where "pleasures" are referred to no less than six times: ἡδονή (lines 3, 5, 6); ἡδιον (line 6); φιλήδονοι (line 8); and ἡδυπαθεῖς (line 9). "Pain-avoidance" is evoked in the first paragraph primarily by the terms ἀκολάστους (line 5) and φυγοπόνιοι (line 9), but also hinted at in the negative portrayal of the mother (who is herself, avoiding the pain of strict childrearing). Thus, Euboule is doing the work of "flattering mother" (κολακευούσης ἔργον ποιήσης); and she must prevent a "distortion" (διαστροφήν) about childrearing. The second paragraph continues the discussion of helping children to deal with hardships: "It is necessary also to train the children who are being reared with respect to what they fear, even if they must be grieved or suffer pain" (δεῖ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὰ φοβερά γυμνάζειν τὰ τρεφόμενα, κἂν λυπηθῇται κἂν πονῆσαι δεῖοι, lines 11–12).

⁶⁸ Lines 15–18.

A third inventory of wrong behavior follows closely in the rhetorical question of lines 18–21.⁶⁹ Here we find a double censure. Now it is Euboule herself who is “fearful,” “honored,” and “laughing” at inappropriate times and providing “much delicacy”: this brings ill effects on her children, and reveals her own not fully virtuous character along with her inability to fill the mother role appropriately. As a flattering mother, it is as if she is enslaved not only to her own emotions but also to the tyranny of the children’s demands. This censure of the mother is combined with that of the behavior of the children, who likewise need to learn not to cry or laugh, not to strike the nurse, not to speak ill of their mother, and not to expect their environment to be comfortable at all times. The parallel drawn by the author might be expressed in the aphorisms: “the apple doesn’t fall very far from the tree” or, “like mother, like child.”

The fourth catalog of vices comes in the form of the indicting rhetorical question previously discussed (in lines 25–31). This set of vices is exhibited by children with whom no reasonable adult would want to be acquainted. The accumulation of childish behaviors serves to strengthen the image of a whining, weak, hostile, selfish, overly active child, not fit for adult company, so that the vices paint a reverse picture of the virtuous conduct to be adopted.

(5) Sustaining the author’s purpose of dissuasion and persuasion, *Theano to Euboule* makes use of *immoral and moral examples*. The first contrast, the one that governs all the censure that follows, is between the “loving mother” and the “flattering mother.” The latter trains her children to live in the expectation of various forms of “customary pleasure” by allowing the immediate gratification of their desires.⁷⁰ This mother not only reacts to the children’s demands but even anticipates whatever might make their lives easier and more pleasurable (e.g., in lines 18–21). Such over-attentiveness to their needs (which is equivalent to what the letter calls “raising your children

⁶⁹ “... besides you are fearful if they cry, and feel honored if they laugh, and laugh if they strike the nurse and if they speak ill of you, and by providing cold during the summer, and heat during the winter, and much delicacy,” ἔτι δὲ φοβουμένην μὲν, ἣν κλάη, φιλοτιμουμένην δέ, ἣν γελᾷ, καὶ τὴν τροφὸν παίη καὶ σε κακῶς εἶπη γελῶσαν, καὶ τοῦ μὲν θέρους ψύχος, τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος καῦμα παρέχουσιν καὶ πολλὴν χλιδὴν.

⁷⁰ In making her children accustomed to pleasures, Euboule (the flattering mother) exhibits one aspect of Plutarch’s definition of the flatterer: “... the flatterer seduces by pleasures and is concerned about pleasures,” ὁ κόλαξ ἡδοναῖς ὑπάγεται καὶ περὶ ἡδονᾶς ἐστίν (*How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend*, Mor. 51B).

in luxury”) is also the behavior of a flatterer, according to Theophrastus. This “character” constantly looks out for the comfort, prestige, and whims of his associate by laughing at his jokes, praising his wine, ensuring his warmth, and fawning over the man’s children.⁷¹ Just as the flatterer seeks to gratify his subject’s wishes, so also the flattering mother caters to what she perceives as her children’s desires.

On the opposite side of the equation, the truly loving mother looks to the impending maturity of her children and thus restricts, disciplines, and trains her children to handle the ups and downs of life with *sōphrosynē*. She demonstrates her correct understanding of the role of mother by maintaining a perspective on their future as free men, guiding them away from slavery (line 33) and from any form of effeminacy (lines 24–25). A good mother recognizes that even poor children, who do not have the possibility of luxurious living, serve as positive examples of how virtue can develop from exposure to hardships (lines 21–23).

However, more notable is the sharp censure of Euboule that immediately follows (lines 24–25), associating both her and her children with a negative example from history: “But you are nursing your children like the offspring of Sardanapallos, enfeebling the nature of the males by pleasures.”⁷² This is a reference to an infamous eighth-century BCE Assyrian ruler, often noted for his licentious living.⁷³ Aristotle used him as a (bad) example of one of the three possible ways that people seek to achieve the good in their lives:

Most people (and the most vulgar ones) assume that “the Good,” or “happiness” is pleasure. For this reason, they love the life devoted to enjoyment. For there are three most preferred [ways of gaining the Good], the one which I have just said [i.e., pleasure], the political, and third, the contemplative. Then, many people appear [to be] completely captive, preferring the life of fatted beasts, and they succeed with their discourse on account of the fact that many of those in authority have feelings similar to those of Sardanapallos.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Χαρακτήρες 2.

⁷² Lines 24–25. This name is sometimes spelled Sardanapalos.

⁷³ Städele phrases it this way: “Sardanapal stellt das ‘Non plus ultra’ der τρυφή orientalischer Herrscher dar Er ist in der hellenischen Welt bereits um 400 als Urbild eines genußsüchtigen, verweichlichten Lebens bekannt sein Luxus wurde sprichwörtlich ...” (*Die Briefe*, 295), where he provides several primary and secondary references. See also the entries under this name in the *Suda*.

⁷⁴ τὸ γὰρ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οὐκ ἀλόγως εἰκόασιν ἐκ τῶν βίων ὑπολαμβάνειν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ φορτικώτατοι τὴν ἡδονήν· διὸ καὶ τὸν βίον ἀγαπῶσι τὸν ἀπολαυστικόν. τρεῖς γάρ εἰσι μάλιστα οἱ προύχοντες, ὃ τε νῦν εἰρημένος καὶ ὁ πολιτικός καὶ τρίτος ὁ θεωρητικός. οἱ μὲν οὖν πολλοὶ παντελῶς ἀνδραποδώδεις φαίνονται βοσκημάτων βίον προαιρούμενοι, τυγχάνουσι δὲ λόγου διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ὁμοιοπαθεῖν Σαρδαναπάλλῳ, Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.* 1095b.

Here Sardanapallos is identified with pleasure (ἡδονή), loving the life of enjoyment (τὸν βίον ἀγαπᾷσι τὸν ἀπολαυστικόν), captives (ἀνδραποδῶδεις), and the life of fatted beasts (βοσκημάτων βίον). Clearly he is not progressing toward the higher philosophical way of life; in fact, he is hardly human.

While writing about Alexander in his *Moralia*, Plutarch included this reference to Sardanapallos:

It has been inscribed in the records of Sardanapalos: “I have as much as I could eat, and I behaved insolently.” Who would not say that in one of these apophthegms we see love of pleasure [φιληδονίαν], and in another godlessness [ἀθεότητα], and in another injustice [ἀδικίαν] and greediness [πλεονεξίαν]?⁷⁵

Plutarch aligns the man with four exceptionally abhorrent vices, one of which, φιληδονία, is also prominently censured in *Theano to Euboule*.⁷⁶ From these and many other many references to Sardanapallos in Greek texts, it is easy to conclude that he was rather generally known as an archetypal hedonistic, arrogant, thoroughly out-of-control tyrant, who focused on the delights of his body.

On the one hand, the behavior of Sardanapallos is not directly compared to Euboule's own behavior. Rather, his way of life is said to be comparable to the present (and future) immoral lives of her children. In effect, these children are already acting as if they too are petty tyrants themselves, since they have their mother dancing attendance on them as if she were a member of their royal court. Similarly in “Theano's” view, their demands for pleasure, for delicacies, comfort, and freedom of action correspond to the infamous behavior of Sardanapallos.

On the other hand, Euboule's “methods” of childrearing are implicated in that her children act as if they are descendants of Sardanapallos: they are taking on his familial characteristics and exhibiting his character faults. The author's chief concern is that the influence of the mother, who is female,

⁷⁵ τοῖς δὲ Σαρδαναπάλου μνημείοις ἐπιγέγραπται ‘ταῦτ’ ἔχω ὅσος ἔφαγον καὶ ἐφύβρισα.’ τίς οὐκ ἂν εἴποι τῶν ἀποφθεγμάτων τούτων τῷ μὲν ἐμφαίνεσθαι φιληδονίαν, τῷ δ’ ἀθεότητα, τῷ δ’ ἀδικίαν καὶ πλεονεξίαν; *Alex.* 330F. Dio Chrysostom also raises this ruler as a negative example in one of his orations, expanding the apophthegm used by Plutarch, *Or.* 4.135. This reference to Sardanapallos’ eating and insulting demeanor is used by at least one later Christian author as well: Clement, *Strom.* 2.20.118.

⁷⁶ The word φιλήδονοι is used in line 8, and see also the repeated references to “pleasure.” The Neopythagorean text ascribed to Diotogenes explicitly links “love of pleasure” with “effeminacy”: “The love of pleasure is in the sphere of the desires, for this is the part of the soul that is feminine and languid,” ἡ δὲ φιλαδονία περὶ τὸ ἐπιθυματικόν, τοῦτο γὰρ θήλυ καὶ ὕγρον μέρος τῆς ψυχᾶς, *On Kingship* 76 (Stob., *Anth.* 4.1.96 [W.-H. 263]).

will have an “enfeebling” (θρύπτουσα) effect⁷⁷ on the children’s “masculine nature” (τὴν τῶν ἀρρένων φύσιν). *Theano to Euboule* implies that these are male children: the warning is that they will not grow up to be “real men”—noble and moderate, virtuous and free—but instead will be “softies,”⁷⁸ a label also applied to Sardanapalos. This letter thus expresses a suspicion that mothers have a problematic role in relation to their boy children: their femaleness may rub off on them.⁷⁹ So even though Sardanapalos is a man, by his own licentious behavior and his captivity to pleasure he is an “effeminate” man and, thus, has possible (im)moral affinities to women.⁸⁰ The application of his example is meant to exhort Euboule to take care that she does not contribute to her sons growing into such soft, enfeebled adult men.⁸¹

Two other examples are raised by the author to explain proper virtue-development in children: children’s endurance of hardships is like the “preliminary” process of dyeing clothing (lines 38–41); and childrearing is akin to the agricultural practice of tending grapevines (41–43).⁸² Both of these

⁷⁷ The verb θρύπτω taken metaphorically means “to corrupt,” “to enfeeble”; in the passive sense “to be enervated, unmanned,” LSJ, s.v. θρύπτω. That seems to me to be the equivalent of “emasculate,” which is exactly the potential disaster imagined for Euboule’s children. The “enfeebling” may also come by means of “debauchery and luxury,” LSJ, s.v. θρύπτω. The verb also exists in an intensified form, ἐπιθρύπτω, also meaning “to enfeeble,” LSJ, s.v. ἐπιθρύπτω. There is thus a conceptual problem in setting a woman in charge of the moral training of her sons, surfacing in the question: can a female exemplar teach males?

⁷⁸ An idiomatic translation of τοῖς δὲ μαλακώτεροι, from line 10. The adjective μαλακός can be used either in a good sense (soft, mild, gentle) or a bad one (cowardly, morally weak, effeminate), LSJ, s.v. μαλακός.

⁷⁹ Linguistically this is shown in the “parēketic” word-plays on forms of τρέφω, and θρύπτω; see Chapter One, nn. 158, 187 on the annotated translation. There is a very fine linguistic line, evidently, between good nurturing and bad spoiling of children. Mothers must be careful to provide the one and avoid the other. (A related common paronomasia arises with τρύφη and τροφή, e.g., lines 2, 5, 7).

⁸⁰ Effeminate men are used as bad examples in the physiognomic texts where masculinity is strongly defined by external markers in contradistinction to femininity. For a detailed discussion of how such texts seek to construct ancient notions of masculinity (and femininity), see Maud W. Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), esp. 55–81.

⁸¹ Likewise, her flattery might accustom the children to that way of being; Plutarch warns that some poorly-raised sons might grow up to hang around with flatterers (κόλακες) and other immoral persons (*The Education of Children*; *Mor.* 5B). This flattering mother cannot be equated with the “flatterer” discussed in Plutarch’s *How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend*, because there Plutarch identifies the flatterer as one who is oriented to “great men,” of higher status (*Mor.* 49C–D; also the relationship of flatterers to demagogues, *Mor.* 52D–F).

⁸² The same example of childrearing as vine-dressing is used by Diotogenes: “Then what is the beginning of every political system? Nurturing the young. For grapevines will never

examples build upon the concept of the parent (here, the mother) as a subject (clothes-dyer and vine-dresser) acting upon the children as objects (clothes and vines), thus reinforcing the hierarchical social relationship between parent and child.

The three kinds of antitheses (warnings-promises, vices-virtues, immoral-moral examples) function as proofs in the manner outlined by Aristotle: by means of *ēthos*, *pathos*, and *logos*.⁸³ In particular, *Theano to Euboule* relies upon *pathos*, persuading the reader by emotional appeals, and *logos*, reaching the reader's rationality. The reader's *pathos* is evoked by the dire warnings and bright promises as well as by the vices-virtues and immoral-moral examples, in that the vivid depictions seek to reach the reader through her emotions. Most especially the caricature of the flattering mother is intended to motivate her (as representative of the audience) to avoid the bad things (including any comparison with Sardanapallos) and to move toward the good. A common-sense kind of *logos* is apparent in three of the examples (the poor children, the dyeing process, and viticulture). The first example purports to be a "real" observation, while the latter two examples are attempts at finding analogies for virtue development and good parenting. These call the reader to think logically about how the examples apply to Euboule's supposed situation.

Since such a letter of censure holds out the possibility that the recipient will change her ways, the author characterizes Euboule negatively as a "flattering mother" but one who, if she pays heed to the instructions, examples, and warnings of the letter, is capable of becoming a "*sōphrōn* mother." For the larger audience, the rhetorical effect of the public censure of Euboule is intensified. Female readers ought to perceive Euboule's mothering as another immoral example so that they distance themselves from such a vision of female "softness" that corrupts "hard" masculinity. This is accomplished by examining themselves for any similar softening effects on their male children and then, at Theano's directive, to reject those emas-

produce beneficial fruit unless they are trained well," τίς οὖν ἀρχὰ πολιτείας ἀπάσας; νέων τροφά. οὐ γὰρ μήποκα τὸν καρπὸν ὄνασιφόρον ἄμπελοι γεννήσωντι, μὴ φυτοτροφηθεῖσαι καλῶς, *On Sanctity* 76 (Stob., *Anth.* 4.1.96 [W-H 36.3–5]). A similar analogy appears in *The Education of Children*: "What trees when they are neglected do not grow twisted and become unfruitful, but when they obtain right culture, they become fruitful, and bring [fruit] to maturity?," ποῖα δὲ δένδρα οὐκ ὀλιγωρηθέντα μὲν στρεβλά φύεται καὶ ἄκαρπα καθίσταται, τυχόντα δ' ὀρθῆς παιδαγωγίας ἔγκαρπα γίγνεται καὶ τελεσφόρα; (Plutarch, *Mor.* 2E).

⁸³ For a summary drawing on Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.3–6; and see Klauck, *Ancient Letters*, 220. I argue that the proof relying upon *ēthos* is discerned in the reputation of the epistolary authorial pseudonym.

culating practices. Meanwhile, male readers might stand somewhat apart from the mothering crisis described herein, because this situation is particular to the influence of the female parent over a male child. Perhaps a father would take away from this letter the idea of supervising the mother in order to develop the wholly masculine nature of his sons.

In all these ways, the author of *Theano to Euboule* adapts various rhetorical strategies to the philosophical letter form, transforming them into teaching methods directed at his/her readership. Such a practice is common to a large body of ancient letters written to and from men (many of which are also pseudepigraphical). Likewise the diatribal style, which is particularly well-suited to this letter of censure, appears in writings from the hands of male authors and teachers. *Theano to Euboule* employs the same textual styles, methods, and aims found in these texts, without changing them for their constructed female recipient or for their ultimate audience of female learners. This means that, as with the paraenetic letters *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, the real author of *Theano to Euboule* assumed that women and men possessed a similar potential for hearing and for enacting the instructions in the letter, and that adult women and men also shared these common values about the goals of childrearing.

Rhetorical Analysis of "Theano to Nikostrate," a Letter of Censure

The second (and longest) letter in the collection *TH3* is another letter of censure, in this instance one that urges a change in the thinking and behavior of a wife whose husband is associating with an *hetaira*. The author perceives that Nikostrate's wrong behavior is rooted in her misunderstanding about what it means to live as a good wife within this marriage. Because Nikostrate is enmeshed in her sufferings, she is unable (or unwilling?) to control herself (both in emotions and actions). Theano calls attention to the wife's mistaken belief by the emphatic use of σύ: "But *you* think love for your husband is not in noble goodness."⁸⁴ To the contrary, asserts the author, "*this* is the grace of the marital partnership."⁸⁵ The author has already laid out this thesis in different wording:

⁸⁴ σύ δὲ τὴν φιλίαν ἡγή τοῦ ἀνδρός οὐκ ἐν τῇ καλοκαγαθίᾳ, lines 16–17.

⁸⁵ τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ χάρις τῆς κοινωνίας, line 17. The author continues to exhort Nikostrate to change by coming to a new recognition of her place in the marriage: "Therefore, *acknowledge* that he goes to the *hetaira* for the purpose of being idle, but he is present with you it is for the purpose of living a common life, and he loves you according to intelligence, but that woman in passion," νόμιζε οὖν πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἑταίραν βραθυμήσοντα πορεύεσθαι ἐκείνον, σοὶ δὲ συμβιῶσοντα παρῆναι, καὶ σὲ μὲν φιλεῖν κατὰ γνώμην, ἐκείνην δὲ τῷ πάθει, lines 17–20.

For the virtue of a married woman is not close surveillance of the husband, but rather companionship [συμπεριφορά]. It is companionship to bear his foolish conduct. Further, he has intercourse with a courtesan for pleasure, but with his wife for advantage [τὸ συμφέρον]. It is advantageous [συμφέρων] not to mix evil with evils, nor to add madness to madness.⁸⁶

The epistolary structure alternates between disapproving descriptions of the conduct of the husband and the wife; yet even though the husband's actions are judged negatively⁸⁷ the author never deviates from the particular goal of correcting Nikostrate herself. The rectification of the wife's thinking and behavior is presented primarily through an assortment of warnings of bad outcomes that are set over against promises of desirable rewards. By imagining these miserable versus optimistic futures, a reader in a similar situation might be persuaded to avoid such an embattled marriage and instead to work toward the vision of marital reconciliation.

The letter has two goals: (1) by appealing to Nikostrate's "advantage" (τὸ συμφέρον),⁸⁸ the author seeks to persuade her that "love of her husband,"

⁸⁶ γαμετῆς γὰρ ἀρετὴ ἐστὶν οὐχ ἡ παρατήρησις τάνδρός, ἀλλ' ἡ συμπεριφορά· συμπεριφορά δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ φέρειν ἄνοιαν. εἴθ' ἑταίρα μὲν πρὸς ἡδονὴν ὀμίλει, γαμετῇ δὲ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον· συμφέρον δὲ κακοῖς κακὰ μὴ μίσγειν, μὴδὲ παρανοία παράνοιαν ἐπάγειν, lines 7–11.

⁸⁷ The *hetaira* is likewise spoken of disparagingly, but the author does not suggest ways for that woman to change her way of life.

⁸⁸ The use of *συμφέρον* associates this letter with deliberative rhetoric: "If one wants to convince people to pursue a particular course of action in the future, one must demonstrate that it is to that audience's advantage. Likewise if one wants to dissuade an audience from a course of action one must demonstrate that it is not advantageous" (Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 25). Linking marriage to "advantage," Musonius Rufus depicts a disastrous marriage where "each [spouse] looks only to their own [advantage], while neglecting that of the other," ἐκάτερος σκοπεῖ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον ἀμελῶν θατέρου, *Fr.* 13A.15. The Stoic Hierocles has a similar view of marriage: "So then I say marriage is also advantageous, first because it brings about truly divine fruit, the birth of children ... and secondly, besides the birth of children, the companionship with a wife is profitable," Φημί τοίνυν καὶ σύμφορον εἶναι τὸν γάμον πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι θεῖον ὡς ἀληθῶς φέρει καρπὸν τὴν παίδων γένεσιν ἔπειτα καὶ πρὸς γένεσιν τέκνων λυσιτελεῖς ἢ μετὰ γυναικὸς συμβίωσις, *On Marriage* 53. 20, 25 (Stob., *Anth.* 4.503.18 [W-H 504.1]). Hierocles goes on to provide a touching portrait of how he thinks a wife helps a husband through the vicissitudes of life. The parallels to *Theano to Nikostrate* are obvious.

Theano to Nikostrate also relies upon deliberative argumentation in its call to substitute "companionship" (συμπεριφορά, lines 8–9), and "partnership" (κοινωνία, line 17) in place of the "fights and reproaches" (αἱ μάχαι καὶ αἱ λοιδορίαι, line 60) that represent the "differences" (διαφοραί, line 45; διαφορὰν, line 61) that exist between wife and husband. While the topic was commonly used for political bodies and discussions, "This lofty ideal of ὁμόνοια was not only applied to city-states, but even to smaller, less formal political and social units" (Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 64). In his description of the "philosophizing woman," Musonius Rufus uses the term for "concord" in relation to marriage, since to her husband, she will be a "like-minded good co-worker," ὁμονοίας ἀγαθὴ συνεργός, *Fr.* 3 (40.26). Although the terms for unity

even when he is “ill” and doing an “injustice” toward her,⁸⁹ is shown in the good conduct of the virtuous wife; and (2) to instruct her regarding what is moral behavior in this particular situation. Although the sender does not anywhere directly state “I censure you,”⁹⁰ the letter contains numerous commands to the recipient to stop certain actions now and adopt different ones in the immediate future. Like *Theano to Euboule*, this letter presents its argument in a strong diatribal style, with four of the five characteristic elements of that style: (1) second person singular address; (2) indicting statements and rhetorical questions; (3) warnings of negative consequences and promises of good outcomes; and (4) moral and immoral examples.

(1) *Second person singular address* occurs in the use of the vocative φίλη, which occurs six times,⁹¹ while the pronoun σύ also appears frequently.⁹² In this letter, such addresses function to keep the focus on the recipient and sharpen the characterization of that person as someone who both thinks wrongheadedly and acts improperly. For example, the author critiques Nikostrate’s actions: “But *you* are depressed both night and through the day, and you are in anguish and are contriving something against him. Don’t *you* do this, my dear!”⁹³ Nikostrate’s supposed opinions about marriage are rebuked with another emphatic σύ: “But *you* think love for your husband

instead of strife are different in *Theano to Nikostrate*, this situation of marital conflict cannot but call to mind conflicts on a larger social scale. Likewise, the very name “Nikostrate,” or “victorious woman-warrior” evokes military conflicts.

One further term positions the letter as a piece of deliberative (συμβουλευτικός) argument: the author has used cognates of βουλευ-. Nikostrate must “resist the counsels of your sufferings!” (σύ δὲ καὶ τὰ βουλευόμενα τοῦ πάθους ἀντίθες, line 47), and she is accused “Will you plan something against him?” (βουλεύσῃ τι κατ’ ἐκείνου; line 62). This suggests that the deliberation is occurring within Nikostrate herself. To all these terms can be added the motif that Nikostrate and the *hetaira* are engaged in a battle, which constructs their relationship as military rivals, and suggests again the larger context of political deliberation.

⁸⁹ τὴν ἀδικίαν τὴν εἰς σέ, line 42.

⁹⁰ The only censure that is referred to is that coming from Nikostrate, who is described as “censuring” her husband. Here the word is ἐλέγχω (lines 12 and 15). There is also the “moral condemnation” (καταγνώσις, lines 28–29) that the husband will eventually sense, which will cause him to “change his mind” (μεταγνώσεται, line 29). Interestingly, Theano reserves the right to censure Nikostrate, but will not allow the latter to censure her own husband.

⁹¹ Lines 3 (with ὦ), 7 (with ὦ), 12, 30, 36, and 62.

⁹² Lines 3, 5, 7, 16, 19 [here, σοί], 19 [σέ], 30, 40 [σοῦ], 42 [σέ], 47, 49 [σέ], 50 [σέ], and 65, plus one occurrence of σεαυτήν, line 52). Probably because it is the longest, this letter accounts for thirteen out of nineteen times that the pronoun occurs in Theano’s letters.

⁹³ σύ δὲ ἄθυμος εἶ καὶ νόκτα καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέραν καὶ ἀδημονεῖς καὶ μηχανᾷ τι κατ’ αὐτοῦ. μὴ σύ γε, ὦ φίλη, lines 5–7.

is not for goodness.”⁹⁴ Although there are textual difficulties in this part of the letter, this statement at the least correlates “love of husband” with “goodness” and implies that Nikostrate thinks otherwise.

(2) *Theano to Nikostrate* also censures by means of *indicting statements and rhetorical questions*, beginning with the description of Nikostrate as a “jealous” woman.⁹⁵ Other indictments of Nikostrate appear throughout the letter: she is “sinning against [her] decorum,”⁹⁶ and “greatly harming [her] advantage”;⁹⁷ she is in danger of neglecting her household⁹⁸ and of destroying her husband⁹⁹ due to their daily fights and reproaches.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, she is contriving something against her husband.¹⁰¹ The author censures all of these as wrong behaviors. Many of these indictments are conveyed by means of a series of four *rhetorical questions* in the last paragraph of the letter:¹⁰²

Q But will you have no care for your household and will you destroy your husband?

A Then you will share the damage of a painful life.

Q But will you revenge yourself on the *hetaira*?

A Being on her guard, she will circumvent you, and when she wards you off, a woman who does not blush is fit for battle.

⁹⁴ σὺ δὲ τὴν φιλίαν ἡγή (lac. indicavi) τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐκ ἐν τῇ καλοκαγαθίᾳ, lines 16–17; on the textual issues, see n. 211 in Chapter One.

⁹⁵ σὺ δὲ ὅτι ζηλοτυπεῖς αὐτόν, line 3. This is followed by the negative description: “But you are depressed both night and through the day, and you are in anguish and are contriving something against him.” Nikostrate’s jealousy is mentioned again: “you must not be jealous of her (for it is only right to be jealous of virtuous women,” οὐ ζηλοτυπητέον οὖν σοι πρὸς ἐκείνην (πρὸς γὰρ τὰς ἐναρέτους ἐκτείνειν τὸν ζῆλον καλόν), lines 33–34. A significant detail to point out is that while Nikostrate’s husband’s activities are not at all considered morally ideal, the author does not subject them to much analysis: (1) his *paranoia* is “the same illness” (τῆς αὐτῆς νόσου, lines 3–4) as many men have, and (2) this illness is brought on by the seductive work of *hetairai*, “for it is as if they [the men] are hunted down and controlled by these women, and they lose their mind” (θηρεύονται γὰρ ὡς ἔοικεν ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν τούτων καὶ κατέχονται καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι νοῦν, lines 4–5).

⁹⁶ σὲ περὶ τὸν κόσμον ἀμαρτάνειν, lines 49–50.

⁹⁷ σὲ καταβλάπτειν τὸ συμφέρον, lines 50–51.

⁹⁸ ἀμελήσεις τοῦ οἴκου, line 56.

⁹⁹ καταφθερεῖς τὸν ἄνδρα, line 56.

¹⁰⁰ ἀλλὰ καλὸν ὅσημέραι μάχεσθαι πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα; καὶ τί πλέον; αἱ γὰρ μάχαι καὶ αἱ λοιδορίαι τὴν μὲν ἀκολασίαν οὐ παύουσιν, τὴν δὲ διαφορὰν ταῖς προκοπαῖς αὖξουσιν, lines 59–62.

¹⁰¹ μηχανᾷ τι κατ’ αὐτοῦ, lines 6–7; τί δέ, βουλευσῇ τι κατ’ ἐκείνου; line 62.

¹⁰² An earlier rhetorical question condemns the husband’s affair with the *hetaira*: “For what is emptier than desire that has enjoyment from injustice?” τί γάρ ἐστι ματαιότερον ἐπιθυμίας ἀπολαυούσης ἀδίκου; lines 23–24. Of course, the expected answer is “Nothing at all.”

Q But is it good to fight every day with your husband? And for what reason?

A For fights and reproaches do not stop intemperance, but they increase the disagreement by their “progress.”

Q So what? Will you plan something against him?

A No, dear. Tragic dramas have taught (us) to master jealous anger by keeping in order, in which (dramas) Medea acted unlawfully.

The rhetorical questions (and their supplied answers) have surrounded Nikostrate on all sides, preventing her from every response to his behavior—destruction, damage, fights with the *hetaira* and her husband, and plots against him—by correcting her reasoning on the subject of the purpose of marriage.

(3) In *Theano to Nikostrate*, antithetical pairings of dire *warnings* and happy *promises* combine with *immoral* and *moral examples* to serve as proofs of the thesis argued by the author.¹⁰³ The *warnings and promises* are directed at the aggrieved wife, urging her to wait out the bad times because good times are sure to come. First, the author warns that the wife’s actions—for good or ill—will affect her marriage, which is perceived as the most important relationship in her adult life. Maintaining the marital relationship is an entirely good thing: not only is marriage “companionship” (ἡ συμπεριφορά) for Nikostrate, but it promises to preserve her own “advantage” (τὸ συμφέρον).¹⁰⁴ This perspective is summed up in Theano’s thesis: “For this is the gift of partnership” (τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ χάρις τῆς κοινωνίας).

Because wife and husband are so interconnected in the marriage partnership, whatever Nikostrate does to her husband, she does to herself: “Since he is greatly harming his life [your counsels encourage] you also to greatly harm your advantage,”¹⁰⁵ and “by punishing him, you punish yourself as well.”¹⁰⁶ The worst possible outcome for a wife is characterized in this “frightening” warning about a woman post-divorce:

¹⁰³ In this letter, the rhetorical part played by catalogues of vices and virtues is hardly significant. There is not any substantive *listing* of virtues, although a short vice list might be perceived in the author’s summary of Nikostrate’s response to her husband: “But you are depressed both night and through the day, and you are in anguish and you are contriving something against him,” σὺ δὲ ἄθυμος εἶ καὶ νύκτα καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέραν καὶ ἀδημονεῖς καὶ μηχανᾷ τι κατ’ αὐτοῦ, lines 5–7.

¹⁰⁴ This is also to her husband’s advantage. Note the *parachēsis* (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 3037) involved in the use of συμπεριφορά and συμφέρον.

¹⁰⁵ καταβλάπτοντος τὸν βίον καὶ σέ καταβλάπτειν τὸ συμφέρον, lines 50–51.

¹⁰⁶ καὶ κολαζομένη ἐκεῖνον καὶ σεαυτὴν κολάζειν, lines 51–52.

For although you might go and get divorced, then you will try your fortune with another man after being divorced from the first man, and if that man transgresses in similar ways, again [you will try] yet another man (for widowhood is not bearable for young women), or you will remain alone without a man—that is to say, very unmarried.¹⁰⁷

Given this somewhat severe assessment of male nature, there is no better man out there than the one Nikostrate already has. Therefore, the consequences of divorcing him are either to experience the same situation repeatedly or else to remain very lonely.

There is a corresponding set of possible positive outcomes for Nikostrate's patient endurance of the situation, some of them framed quite sweetly. These promises are based on the perceived power of the wife's dignified silence and calm tolerance to cause a change in her husband's behavior. If Nikostrate will pull back her emotionally over-involved response to her husband, if she will cease her plotting, stop her arguing, and instead change her thinking¹⁰⁸ by considering the *advantage* of her marriage, then the author promises an improved situation. In fact, if the wife makes the first move toward a marital reconciliation, this will bring about a change in her husband:

Therefore, when he is patiently attended by you he will be all the more ashamed, and he will wish to be reconciled quickly, and he will love you more affectionately, since he has come to recognize his injustice toward you, because he comprehends your attention to his way of life and receives the proof of your love towards him. And just as evil sufferings of the body make their endings pleasant, so the differences between lovers bring about more intimate reconciliations.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀφεμένη πορεύσῃ, ἑτέρου ἄρα πειραθήσῃ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ προτέρου ἀπαλλαγείσα, κὰν ἐκεῖνος ἀμάρτῃ τὰ ὅμοια, πάλιν ἄλλου οὐ φορητὴ γὰρ νέαις χηρεία, ἡ μόνῃ μενεῖς ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς οἷόν περ ἄζυξ, lines 52–55. A woman alone is thus a sad and fearful image, as with the violent despoina in *Theano to Kallisto*, lines 25–29; see below for further discussion of that letter.

¹⁰⁸ For instance, she ought to recognize that that her husband's involvement with the *hetaira* is “short; for it has its climax and then immediate satisfaction, and it happens quickly and stops,” βραχύς δὲ ὁ τοῦτου καιρὸς· ἅμα γὰρ ποτε ἔχει καὶ κόρον, καὶ παρίσταται ταχύ καὶ παύεται, lines 21–22. Plutarch also mentions the brevity of such a liaison when he criticizes husbands who will “allow [their wives] to be distressed on account of their own momentary pleasure [with an *hetaira*],” δι' ἡδονὴν αὐτῶν βραχείαν οὕτω κακουμένης περιορᾶν, *Advice, Mor.* 144C–D (44).

¹⁰⁹ κατερτομένους γοῦν ὑπὸ σοῦ μᾶλλον αἰσχύνεται, τάχιον δὲ διαλλαγῆναι θελήσει, προσπαθήσπερον δὲ φιλοστοργήσει συνεγνωκῶς τὴν ἀδικίαν τὴν εἰς σέ, κατανοῶν τε τὴν προσοχὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ βίου καὶ πείραν τῆς στοργῆς λαμβάνων τῆς πρὸς αὐτόν. ὥσπερ δὲ αἱ κακοπάθειαι τοῦ σώματος ἡδείας τὰς ἀναπαύσεις ποιοῦσιν, οὕτως αἱ διαφοραὶ τῶν φίλων οἰκιοτέρας τὰς διαλλαγὰς φέρουσι, lines 40–46.

The author's logic rests solidly on such hopeful promises of relief from suffering and, even more, of future affectionate reconciliation between husband and wife.

(4) A few examples serve to prove the author's argument that Nikostrate ought to bear patiently with this errant behavior by her husband. The first to appear is the *hetaira* who stands as an immoral female figure. While in *Melissa to Kleareta* the clothing of the *hetaira* is an issue, in *Theano to Nikostrate* the *hetaira*'s supposed sexual predation is naturally forefronted, since that is the epistolary occasion posited by the author. Again, the image of the *hetaira* "hunting" for men is used; once the men are "caught," the *hetaira* "controls" them.¹¹⁰ Because the husband's association with the *hetaira* has no good results for his behavior (her sexual power causes him to love "with passion" [τῷ πάθει] and to act "with injustice" [τὴν ἀδικίαν]),¹¹¹ the *hetaira* is implicitly responsible for this immoral behavior on the part of the man. Thus her seductive influence is not a pattern for a good wife to follow. So the *hetaira* is a powerful figure and has more advanced fighting skills than Nikostrate: "Being on her guard, she will circumvent you, and when she wards you off, a woman who does not blush is fit for battle [μάχιμος]."¹¹² Nikostrate must distinguish herself from the *hetaira* not only by *not* battling with the *hetaira*, but also by refraining from fights [μάχαί] with her husband.¹¹³ The way for her to achieve victory (νίκη) in this struggle is to take a hands-off

¹¹⁰ θηρεύονται γὰρ ὡς ἔοικεν ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν τούτων καὶ κατέχονται καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι νοῦν, lines 4–5. In fact, the warrior-*hetaira* deviates from "good womanhood" by engaging in "masculine" activities: she "hunts," she "fights," she "controls men," and she is sexually involved outside of a sanctioned marriage.

¹¹¹ Plutarch similarly stresses the distinction between a husband's liaison with a *hetaira* and his marriage to his wife: "And just as Phocion said when Antipater ordered him to do something that was neither good nor fitting, 'You are not able to have me both as a friend and a flatterer,' in this way [her husband must] think about his wife, 'I am not able to live with her both as a spouse and as an *hetaira*,'" καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Φωκίων, τοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου πρᾶξιν αὐτῷ προστάττοντος οὐ καλὴν οὐδὲ πρέπουσαν, εἶπεν οὐ δύνασθαι μοι καὶ φίλῳ χρῆσθαι καὶ κόλακι, οὕτω λογίζεσθαι περὶ τῆς σώφρονος καὶ αὐστηρᾶς γυναικὸς οὐ δύναμαι τῇ αὐτῇ καὶ ὡς γαμετῇ καὶ ὡς ἑταίρᾳ συνεῖναι, *Advice, Mor.* 142B–C (29). This advice sets up at the same time a "*sōphrōn* and unadorned" ideal of wifely sexuality, while holding the husband responsible for behaving moderately toward his wife.

¹¹² ἀλλ' ἀμυνεῖ τὴν ἑταίραν; περιστήσεται σε φυλαττομένη, κὰν ἀμύνη, μάχιμός ἐστιν οὐκ ἐρυθηρίοσα γυνή, lines 57–59.

¹¹³ "But is it good to fight [μάχεσθαι] every day with your husband? And for what reason? For fights [μάχαί] and reproaches do not stop intemperance, but they increase the disagreement by their 'progress,'" lines 59–62.

approach,¹¹⁴ a behavior completely opposite to that of the aggressive *hetaira*.

The one positive example for the wife is placed in direct opposition to the *hetaira*: “Therefore, you must not be jealous of her [i.e., the *hetaira*] (for it is right only to be jealous of virtuous women).”¹¹⁵ Here the “jealousy,” ὁ ζήλος, that is urged comes in the form of *imitation* of “virtuous women.”¹¹⁶ The attitudes and actions of “virtuous women” are implicitly defined by the command that follows: “and you should present yourself as disposed to reconciliation.”¹¹⁷ We may presume that these good women would also represent whatever the author holds up as moral behavior for women throughout the letter.

Two “natural” examples are employed as proofs for the correctness of the author’s counsel.¹¹⁸ First is the process of stopping a fire: “Some sins, dear, when they are censured are stirred up still more, but when they are kept still [σιωπώμενα], indeed, they stop, as they say, fire is extinguished by stillness [ἡσυχία].”¹¹⁹ Because the words σιωπάω and ἡσυχία both connote “still” in the auditory sense as well as “still” in lack of movement¹²⁰ this metaphor

¹¹⁴ This is stated literally: “But just as it is necessary to keep one’s hands away from an eye infection, thus also you must set aside the claim of your suffering,” ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ τῆς νόσου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπέχειν δεῖ τὰς χεῖρας, οὕτως καὶ σὺ τοῦ πάθους χώριζε τὴν προσποίησιν.

¹¹⁵ οὐ ζηλοτυπητέον οὖν σοι πρὸς ἐκείνην (πρὸς γὰρ τὰς ἐναρέτους ἐκτείνειν τὸν ζῆλον καλόν), lines 33–34.

¹¹⁶ Note the cognate connection between “being jealous” (ζηλοτυπέω) and “emulation” (ζήλος/ζηλόω). In fact, Ps.-Libanius expresses the value of imitating examples within the content of a paraenetic letter-sample: “Always be an emulator [ζηλωτής], my good friend, of the excellent men. For it is better while emulating [ζηλοῦντα] good men to hear a good [report], than when following after base men to be reproached by all.” Παραίνετική. Ζηλωτῆς ἀεὶ, βέλτιστε, γενοῦ τῶν ἐναρέτων ἀνδρῶν. κρεῖττον γὰρ ἐστὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ζηλοῦντα καλὸν ἀκούειν ἢ φαύλοις ἐπόμενον ἐπονείδιστον εἶναι τοῖς πᾶσιν, *Ep.* 52. See also the evidence presented by Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; eds. Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991); on imitating God, 76; and on imitation as an educational technique, 85.

¹¹⁷ ἐαυτὴν δὲ παρεκτέον ἐπιτηδεῖαν ταῖς διαλλαγαῖς, lines 34–35.

¹¹⁸ Curiously, both of these examples are also used by Plutarch in *A Consolation to His Wife*, in his censure of “bad women” (κακῶν γυναικῶν) who visit a house of mourning with “cries and wailing” (φωνὰς καὶ συνεπιθρηνήσεις), *Mor.* 610C (7). Plutarch believes that these women are “bringing fire upon fire” (πῦρ ἐπὶ πῦρ φερούσαις). He states: “For when people see the houses of friends burning, they extinguish [the fire], by what speed and power each one has, but by means of inflamed souls, they bring forward more fuel [for the fire],” τὰς μὲν γὰρ οἰκίας τῶν φίλων ὅταν καιομένας ἴδωσι, σβεννύουσιν ὥς ἔχει τάχους ἕκαστος ἢ δυνάμειος, ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς φλεγομέναις αὐτοὶ προσφέρουσιν ὑπεκκαύματα, *Mor.* 610C (7). Thus, both Plutarch and *Theano* to *Nikostrate* use the fire analogy for women’s (wrong and irrational) speech and behavior.

¹¹⁹ ἔνια δὲ ἀμαρτήματα, φιλη, ἐλεγχόμενα μὲν ἐπὶ πλεόν ἀνερθεῖται, σιωπώμενα δὲ παύεται μάλλον, ὥς τὸ πῦρ ἡσυχία φασὶ σβέννυσθαι, lines 12–14.; LSJ, s.v. σιωπάω and ἡσυχία.

¹²⁰ This dual meaning also applies to a virtuous woman adorning herself with ἀσυχία in

works in two ways. We are perhaps meant to think of the “roaring” sound of a fire, as well as how it grows when it is blown upon but goes out when deprived of oxygen. The author states that Nikostrate is able to stir up the “fire” surrounding her husband’s sins: “For if you, by censuring him when he wishes to escape your notice, take off the veil of his passion, then he will perform his sin openly.”¹²¹ Extending the metaphor, the “sound of the fire” will increase because more people would be aware of the true situation. At the same time, Nikostrate might be giving more fuel to the fire of her husband’s hot passion for the *hetaira*. It is one of the ironies of this gender differentiation that while the fire has been started and maintained, so to speak, by her husband, it is the wife who is said to have the power either to make the fire rage, or else to extinguish it.

The second natural example comes in the last lines of the letter, where Nikostrate is urged to take a hands-off approach—literally: “But just as it is necessary to keep one’s hands away from an eye infection, thus also you must set aside the claim of your suffering; for by bearing patiently, you will extinguish his passion more quickly.”¹²² Plutarch employs this same metaphor in advising his wife not to let her grief be “inflamed”: “And one does not allow anyone who wishes to move their hands towards one’s eye, nor to touch eyes that have a sickness.”¹²³ Both Plutarch and *Theano to Nikostrate* use the example to counsel women to endure emotionally difficult circumstances (mourning the death of a child; a husband’s liaison with an *hetaira*) with dignified patience.

An intense negative example is delivered as the climax of the series of rhetorical questions near the end of the letter: the tragic figure of Medea.¹²⁴ The author asks “So what? Will you plan something against him? No, dear.

Melissa to Kleareta (see above), and to the female learners in 1 Tim 2:11–12, who are to learn ἐν ἡσυχία (that is, “to sit still” and “to be silent”).

¹²¹ ἐάν γάρ βουλόμενόν σε λεληθέναι δοκεῖν ἐλέγχουσα ἀφαιρήσης τὸ παρακάλυμμα τοῦ πάθους, καὶ φανερώς ἀμαρτήσεται, lines 14–16.

¹²² ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ τῆς νόσου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπέχειν δεῖ τὰς χεῖρας, οὕτως καὶ σὺ τοῦ πάθους χωρίζε τὴν προσποίησιν, διακαρτεροῦσα γὰρ θάττον τὸ πάθος σβέσεις, lines 64–67. Several references to earlier motifs in the letter are found in this conclusion: illness, passions/suffering, enduring and quenching a fire (quickly).

¹²³ καὶ τῷ μὲν ὀφθαλμῶντι τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐῷσι προσάγειν τὸν βουλόμενον οὐδ’ ἄπτονται τοῦ φλεγμαίνοντος, *A Consolation to His Wife*, *Mor.* 610C (7).

¹²⁴ This is the only literary reference in the Pythagorean women’s letters. The story of Medea appears to be well-known enough, by artistic representations or theatrical performances, to the audience of this letter that this brief evocation is sufficient to make the point. See North’s discussion of Euripides’ depiction of Medea as the opposite of *sōphrosynē* (*Sophrosyne*, 69–79).

Tragic dramas, in which Medea acted unlawfully, have taught (us) to master jealous anger by keeping it in order.”¹²⁵ In Euripides’ tragedy, Medea is placed in the role of the archetypal jealous Greek wife, and she does indeed plot horrific things against her husband. Her actions have an even wider impact, resulting in ruin for everyone involved: by murdering Jason’s newly-betrothed (second) wife Glauce, Glauce’s father Creon, as well as her own children by Jason, she brings grief to herself and prophesies doom to Jason. In all these things, she transgresses against the law (παρὰνομεῖν, line 64); her actions demonstrate a complete “failure in *sophrosyne*.”¹²⁶ An indication that Nikostrate is similarly plotting against her husband is stated early on in the letter: “... you are contriving something against him.”¹²⁷ The negative consequences of such behavior have already been predicted: harm to her own advantage and ensuing personal desolation. In the last paragraph, the author leads up to the example of Medea with the question: “But will you have no care for your household and will you destroy your husband?”¹²⁸ As with Medea, Nikostrate’s unlawful and uncontrolled actions would also detrimentally affect her household and her husband.

The value of Medea as an example for Nikostrate is unambiguously stated: “Tragic dramas have taught (us) to master jealous anger” (line 63). Even tragedies can be used as teaching instruments in this pedagogy of imitation and avoidance. By bringing up such a strong and repellent example¹²⁹ as Medea, the author appears to say that Nikostrate’s situation is not as bad as all that, a fact supported by the reasons given for the husband’s association with the *hetaira*. His behavior is explained as: (1) the result of the *hetaira*’s “hunt”; (2) as a mental illness (he has a “madness,” he has “lost his mind”); (3) typical for “many men” (πολλούς) and, (4) as a temporary satisfaction of passion by “a man who is not exceedingly bad.”¹³⁰ Thus, Nikostrate’s situation

¹²⁵ τί δέ, βουλευῶση τι κατ’ ἐκείνου; μή, φίλη. Ζηλοτυπίας κρατεῖν ἢ τραγωδία ἐδίδαξε, δραμάτων ἔχουσα σύνταξιν, ἐν οἷς παρηνόμησε Μήδεια, lines 62–64.

¹²⁶ North, *Sophrosyne*, 71. According to North, Euripides’ ode comments on “the rage and jealousy to which excessive *erôs* has led Medea” (ibid., 74).

¹²⁷ μηχανῶ τι κατ’ αὐτοῦ, lines 6–7.

¹²⁸ ἀλλ’ ἀμελήσεις τοῦ οἴκου καὶ καταφθερεῖς τὸν ἄνδρα; line 56.

¹²⁹ This example must have been chosen to evoke much πάθος in the letter’s audience.

¹³⁰ ἀνδρὶ μὴ σφόδρα κακῶ, line 23. Since the letter is not addressed to the husband himself, we do not know how the author might have exhorted him about his behavior. However, it appears that the author does not approve of such extramarital sexual relations, since they arise from the man’s uncontrolled passion; his attraction to pleasure; his “desire that has enjoyment from injustice” (ἐπιθυμία ἀπολαυούσης ἀδικίου); his life is “diminished” (μειῶν) and his decency slandered (διαβέβλων τὸ εὖσχημον).

is different from that of Medea: her husband has not obtained a second wife; rather he has “only” associated with an *hetaira*, which the author considers to be a common practice. Nikostrate is his legitimate wife, the mother of his legitimate children, and the manager of his household. He does not intend to divorce her or send her away, as Jason proposed for Medea. The author assures Nikostrate that her husband will eventually come to his senses and return for “more intimate reconciliations.” Thus, Nikostrate’s situation is presented as having a better potential outcome than that of Medea and Jason.

To reach that end, the author carefully maintains the focus on Nikostrate’s response to the situation. Nikostrate has the opportunity to demonstrate that her own rational and virtuous character is opposite to that of Medea:

... by excelling in (your) orderly behavior towards your husband, and in attentiveness toward your household, in your dealings concerning female slaves, and in tender love concerning your children. Therefore, you must not be jealous of her (for it is right only to be jealous of virtuous women), and you should present yourself as disposed to reconciliation. For noble traits offer goodwill even with enemies, dear, and honor is a product of noble goodness alone, and by means of it a wife can surpass her husband in authority and give herself honor instead of serving the enemy.¹³¹

The options placed before Nikostrate are clarified by the immoral example of Medea: either “close surveillance of the husband” (ἡ παρατήρησις τάνδρός) or “companionship” (ἡ συμπεριφορά); either sharing “the damage of a painful life” (βίου συνδιαίρησιν τὴν βλάβην) or “the gift of partnership” (ἡ χάρις τῆς κοινωνίας); either Medea’s murderous response or the moral propriety of a *Niko-strate*, a victorious woman warrior.

In summary, *Theano to Nikostrate* reworks certain rhetorical strategies in order to compose this letter of censure. The letter begins by critiquing Nikostrate’s wrong understanding of the purpose of marriage, as well as the improper behavior that results from her erroneous thinking. Using several elements of the diatribal style, the author supplies the necessary moral correction to the named recipient. By means of indictments, rhetorical questions, and intertwined antitheses of warnings-promises and immoral-moral

¹³¹ τῇ μὲν εὐταξίᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα διαφέρουσα, τῇ δὲ ἐπιμελείᾳ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον, τῇ δὲ συναλλαγῇ περὶ τὰς χρωμένους, τῇ δὲ φιλοστοργίᾳ περὶ τὰ τέκνα. οὐ ζηλοτυπητέον οὖν σοι πρὸς ἐκείνην πρὸς γὰρ τὰς ἐναρέτους ἐκτείνειν τὸν ζῆλον καλόν, ἐαυτὴν δὲ παρεκτέον ἐπιτηδεῖαν ταῖς διαλλαγαῖς· τὰ γὰρ καλὰ ἦθῃ καὶ παρ’ ἐχθροῖς εὖνοιαν φέρει, φίλη, καὶ μόνῃς καλοκαγαθίας ἔργον ἐστὶν ἡ τιμὴ, ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ δυνατὸν ἄνδρὸς ἐξουσίαν καθυπερέχειν γυναῖκί, καὶ τιμᾶσθαι πλεόν ἢ θεραπεύειν τὸν ἐχθρόν, lines 30–38.

examples, Nikostrate is dissuaded from her present activities which the author says are only increasing her marital conflict, and persuaded to adopt new attitudes and behaviors in the future which will lead to reconciliation and a renewed commitment to the advantage of both partners. In adapting these tactics in a letter supposedly from one woman to another, the pseudonymous author demonstrates a rootedness in Greco-Roman rhetorical education. By extending such teaching methods to the composition of a text focused on the moral development of women, the author evinces two beliefs: that a woman like Theano could be expected to produce such a letter and that a female audience could be reached by the same kinds of rhetorical strategies directed to male readers.

Rhetorical Analysis of "Theano to Kallisto," a Paraenetic Letter

The structure of this letter proceeds quite logically from the imagined epistolary occasion: an older woman writes because a newly-married woman needs advice on how to manage household slaves. A thesis statement is laid out with concision: "My dear, goodwill [εὐνοία] is of greatest importance in slave relations."¹³² Such goodwill arises from two causes that are clearly delineated in the letter: "just employment" (δικαία χρῆσις, line 12) and proper discipline of slaves' disorderly conduct (lines 20–44).¹³³ The author offers proofs of the claim of the centrality of goodwill in the forms of philosophical assertions (e.g., "they are human beings by nature," lines 13–14) and of examples from real life: first, of abusive *despoinai*,¹³⁴ who reap the negative effects of engendering ill-will, then of the correct tuning of musical instruments. The letter closes with the flourish of a well-known moral-philosophical *gnome* used as a proof: "proportion is best in all things."¹³⁵ This letter states its paraenetic purpose up front: "... the teaching [διδασκαλία] ought to come from the older women because they are forever giving advice [παραινούντων] about

¹³² ἔστι δέ, ὡ φίλη, μέγιστον ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ εὐνοία, lines 8–9.

¹³³ The demarcation between topics is found in the transitional phrases: "So much for the diet. Now as to disorderly conduct ..." (καὶ πρὸς μὲν τὴν δίαίταν οὕτως· πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἀταξίας, line 20). Here πρὸς δέ signals the change of topic, rather than περὶ δέ.

¹³⁴ I apply this label to the women whom the author calls "some women" (ἔνιαι, lines 14 and 32). Their behavior with slaves is described as "maltreatment" (line 15; with a longer description of physical abuse in lines 32–39). The word *despoina* is used for one of these women in line 37, and the synonym *kuria* appears in line 26. The authoritative status of the *despoina* vis-à-vis her slaves is characterized as "to rule over" (ἄρχειν, line 3); and "rule" (ἄρχή, line 8).

¹³⁵ μέτρον δ' ἐπὶ πάντων ἄριστον, lines 44–45.

household management.”¹³⁶ The vocabulary of instruction and the idea of an instructional process are carried through in the next sentence: “For it is good first to learn [μανθάνειν] the things you do not know and to consider the counsel [τὴν συμβουλὴν] of the older women the most suitable, for a young soul must be brought up in these things from girlhood.”¹³⁷ This last clause signals the idea that paraenesis offers “reminders of what is already known,” in contrast to new teachings; in fact, the author points out that “these things” ought to be continually taught to girls when they are young. Entirely absent from this paraenetic letter are the diatribal stylistic features of the letters of censure, *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate*. Rather, the manner of the sender toward the recipient is friendly throughout, with even a witty self-reference to the older women who are “forever giving advice.” Also, as I have already pointed out, the teaching-learning situation is based on older women instructing younger women.¹³⁸

In fact, the sender is so self-effacing that there is no first-person singular pronoun, verb, or participle that might strengthen the presence of “Theano”; instead, she is subsumed in the collective “the older women.” The named recipient Kallisto is represented with three uses of σοί (lines 18, 21, 26) and two second-person singular verbs (γνώσῃ, line 27; ἴσθι, line 40). Also, she is among the group of “younger women” in the second-person plurals ταῖς νεωτέραις ὑμῖν (line 2), and γιγνώσκετε (lines 5–6). Three occurrences of the characteristic φίλη express the pleasant relationship between the two women.

The author draws upon the example of abusive *despoinai* two times. First, their “maltreatment of their female slaves” (τὴν τῶν θεραπαινῶν κακουχίαν, lines 14–15) is a matter of unfair use of the slaves: by putting them to work at hard jobs and then cutting back on their provisions.¹³⁹ The consequences of this action are negative for both the *despoina* and the slaves, namely, rather than “goodwill” the household is rife with “the worst disaffections

¹³⁶ ἡ δὲ διδασκαλία παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀπαντᾶν ὀφείλει περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας αἰεὶ παραινοῦντων, lines 3–5.

¹³⁷ καλῶς γὰρ ἔχει πρότερον μανθάνειν ἢ μὴ γιγνώσκετε, καὶ τὴν συμβουλὴν οἰκιοτάτην τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἡγεῖσθαι· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ παρθενοτροφεῖσθαι δεῖ νέαν ψυχὴν, lines 5–7. The mention of “counsel” (τὴν συμβουλὴν, line 6) signals this letter’s nearness to the deliberative species of rhetoric.

¹³⁸ In neither Titus nor *Theano to Kallisto* are the “older women” and “younger women” portrayed explicitly in mother-daughter relationships. Cf. Xen. *Oec.*, where a mother is said to teach her daughter σωφροσύνη.

¹³⁹ βαρύνουσαι μὲν τοῖς ἔργοις, ὑποστελλόμεναι δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, lines 15–16.

and plots.”¹⁴⁰ Second, as punishment for the slaves’ “disorderly” behavior, the abusive *despoina* herself becomes disorderly and whips her slaves’ bodies.¹⁴¹ Once again, the results are harmful to both the *despoina* and her slaves: the slaves are “destroyed” (ἀνηλώθησαν, line 35), or they are delivered “by escape” (φυγῇ, line 36), or they may even kill themselves (lines 36–37). Meanwhile the *despoina* remains all alone, lamenting her own thoughtlessness in a “desolate repentance” (ἔρημον μετάνοιαν, line 38). The examples of the immoral *despoinai* function as a *pathos*-laden warning to the readers of the potential for self-injury by such household “rulers.”

When Kallisto is commanded to “be an imitator of the musical instruments” (ἴσθι μιμουμένη τὰ ὄργανα, line 40) the example first seems to liken her to a musical instrument, but it becomes clear that it is the slaves who are the instruments, with Kallisto in the role of instrument tuner.¹⁴² This example focuses on the opposite extremes of instruments that are either too loosely or too tightly strung; the good *despoina* will avoid the extremes and ensure that her slaves are tuned to just the right pitch. The implication is that correct tuning will lead to a metaphorically “harmonious” relationship between a *despoina* and her slaves. Then again, this example also functions in a literal way, since τὰ ὄργανα may also mean “slave-instruments” as part of the household property, as found in Aristotle’s *Politics*:

Therefore, since property is part of the household, and the art of acquiring property is part of household management ... just as certainly for the defined arts it would be necessary to begin with the proper instruments [τὰ οἰκεία ὄργανα], if the work is going to be completed, thus also for the household manager. Now some of the instruments are inanimate and some are animate ... thus also the acquired property is an instrument for life, and the property is full of instruments, and the slave is a kind of animate piece of property.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ δυσνοίαις καὶ ἐπιβουλαῖς κακίσταις, lines 17–18. Note the fitting contrast between “good-will” (εὐνοία, line 9), which is singular in form, whereas “disaffections” (δυσνοίαις, line 17) is plural. The former suggests a united, satisfied group of slaves, while the latter intimates a dysfunctional group of malevolent slaves.

¹⁴¹ “For some women, my dear, from cruelty, even whip the bodies of their female slaves, becoming brutal because of jealousy or anger, just as if they were inscribing a record of the excess of their bitterness,” ἔνια γάρ, ὦ φίλη, ὑπ’ ὀμότητος καὶ μαστιζοῦσι τὰ τῶν θεραπεινῶν σώματα, θηριοῦμεναι διὰ ζήλον ἢ θυμόν, οἷον ὑπομνηματογραφούμεναι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς πικρίας, lines 32–35.

¹⁴² The example of properly-tightened string instruments is used by Plutarch to define the actions of a true friend as like: “... one skilled in music ... [who] first relaxes and then tightens [a string] and so is often pleasant and always profitable,” ἀρμονικός ... τὰ μὲν ἐνδιδοὺς τὰ δ’ ἐπιτείνων πολλάκις μὲν ἡδὺς αἰεὶ δ’ ὠφέλιμός ἐστι (*How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend*, *Mor.* 55D).

¹⁴³ Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἡ κτήσις μέρος τῆς οἰκίας ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ κτητικὴ μέρος τῆς οἰκονομίας ... ὥσπερ διή

In *Theano to Kallisto*, the image of slaves as musical instruments being tuned to perfection is laid over the concept of slaves as living instruments of household property, managed by an *oikonomikos*. The balanced “tuning” of instruments is further reinforced by means of a philosophical maxim as “proof”: “proportion is best in all things,” a *gnomē* found in various texts, including the much-used Pythagorean *Golden Verses*.¹⁴⁴

Clearly *Theano to Kallisto* may be placed in the category of an ancient paraenetic letter: it mentions paraenesis as a reminder of what ought to be already known (and which no one in their right mind would object to) and thus it has a very friendly tone. That the author knows how to make a thesis statement and to divide the argument in an organized fashion means that the letter conforms to certain expectations of rhetorical and/or philosophical compositional standards. The examples of abusive *despoinai* and of musical instruments provide the common sense “arguments” in favor of the thesis. In summing up the entire letter with a Pythagorean maxim, the author draws upon a similarly obvious kind of proof. In all these ways, *Theano to Kallisto* finds its historical context in the realm of ancient Greco-Roman moral-philosophical literature. While nearly every other philosophical letter from that time, pseudepigraphical or not, appears to be explicitly addressed to a male audience, this letter and the others studied here take up the same rhetorical strategies and target a female audience. The author betrays no assumption that women might need some especially feminine methods of persuasion in order to follow the path of moral excellence: a philophronetic, paraenetic letter using examples as proofs and a very popular maxim will work just as well with a female audience as with a male one.

To summarize, all five letters attributed to Pythagorean female philosophers utilize the kinds of written instructional techniques common to other

ταῖς ὀρισμέναις τέχναις ἀναγκαῖον ἂν εἴη ὑπάρχειν τὰ οἰκεῖα ὄργανα, εἰ μέλλει ἀποτελεσθῆσθαι τὸ ἔργον, οὕτω καὶ τῷ οἰκονομικῷ. τῶν δ' ὀργάνων τὰ μὲν ἄψυχα τὰ δὲ ἐμψυχα ... οὕτω καὶ τὸ κτῆμα ὄργανον πρὸς ζωὴν ἐστί, καὶ ἡ κτήσις πλῆθος ὀργάνων ἐστί, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος κτῆμά τι ἐμψυχον, *Pol.* 1253b. See also n. 230 below, which quotes Aristotle on the “just employment” of slave-instruments.

¹⁴⁴ The sentence has the same form in the *Golden Verses*: μέτρον δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστον. On this saying, Thom states “The final γνώμη (*GV* 38b) is actually made up out of two famous sayings, namely, μέτρον ἄριστον and καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος. It summarizes everything said in *GV* 32–38, and encapsulates like no other the virtue of σωφροσύνη ...” (*The Pythagorean “Golden Verses” With Introduction and Commentary* [Religions in the Graeco-Roman World series, vol. 123; eds. R. van den Broek, H.J.W. Drijvers, and H.S. Vernel; New York: Brill, 1995], 162–163). For additional references, see Städele, *Die Briefe*, 330–331; and Thom, *Pythagorean “Golden Verses,”* nn. 299, 300.

ancient philosophical letters: friendly paraenetic reminders thought to be universally acceptable; antithetical reasoning, embodied in vice and virtue lists, as well as in warnings of judgment and promises of rewards; the vocative addresses, rhetorical questions, and strong language of the diatribe; the negative tone and indictments of censorious letters; and the positioning of historical and mythical figures, both moral and immoral, that will persuade or dissuade by their obvious example. That these strategies are directed toward female recipients illustrate that women were thought to be sensitive to the same methods of teaching as were men. Moreover, it means that these authors perceived women as possessing at least some broadly human capacity for making moral progress in spite of their biological “deficiencies.” Otherwise, we would uncover different epistolary “teaching” approaches for male and female learners. Instead, ancient moral-philosophical training for women does have gender-differentiated aspects, but these exist at the levels of teachers (as already seen in the selection of women’s names), and of subject matter (as will be elucidated in the next chapter).

CHAPTER FOUR

TOPICS FOR WOMEN

While the instructional methods found in Pythagorean women's letters are indeed similar to those adopted in philosophical letters from male authors and written to male recipients, the topics addressed reveal conspicuous differences between moral-philosophical training for women and that for men: the only appropriate arena for displays of female virtue is in the context of her household. Accordingly, the Pythagorean letters together cover the three social roles—wife, mother, and household manager—that a woman ought to perform properly in order to demonstrate her virtue. Each letter describes clearly one or more aspects of what it means for women to live a moral life. Such gender-specific subject matter, which is the knowledge base of a course of study, is the last of the four essential curricular elements I have delineated for this investigation.

SUBJECT MATTER: MELISSA TO KLEARETA¹

The manufactured epistolary occasion of *Melissa to Kleareta* sets the stage for the pseudonymous author to give the recipient advice on how to acquire σωφροσύνη.² The contents of the letter thus remain within the well-known contours of the “good woman” *topos*: a virtuous woman will acquire *sōphrosynē*, which for a woman is exhibited primarily in her marital fidelity,³ which

¹ As in Chapter Three, I present the letters in the most typical order of their collection.

² As has already been discussed in the Introduction, the virtue *sōphrosynē* is closely associated with the *topos* of the “good woman” from its earliest literary appearances. North states: “Sophrosyne is the primary virtue of women in Greek inscriptions, often the only one mentioned, or the only moral virtue amid a list of physical qualities, social attributes, and domestic accomplishments” (*Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* [Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 35; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966], 253; cf. also *ibid.*, 1, n. 2).

³ In the structure of the two Pythagorean treatises (*On the Harmony of a Woman* and *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman*), the husband is almost always mentioned first in lists of household members, as in Periktione's statement: “Therefore, by mastering desire and anger, she becomes devout and harmonious, so that lawless passions do not pursue her, but she will have love toward *husband* and *children* and *household* altogether,” κρατέουσα ὧν ἐπιθυμίας

in turn is demonstrated literally in her proper bodily adornment and in the fulfillment of her household roles. Since *Melissa to Kleareta* opens both the collection *MM* and Composite A, we can reliably read the letter as “programmatically” for the letters that follow. That is, “the *sōphrōn* and married woman” (τὰν σώφρονα καὶ ἐλευθέραν, line 5) would be eager to abide by the paraenesis offered in the remaining letters, which give more detail about the *sōphrōn* woman’s responsibilities in the household.

In *Melissa to Kleareta*, as in many other similar texts, the contours of *sōphrosynē* for women are seen above all in the wife’s marital faithfulness:⁴ she ought “to belong to her lawful husband” (τῷ κατὰ νόμον ἀνδρὶ ποτῆμεν, lines 5–6) a thought which is later expanded “to please her own husband by making his wishes complete” (ἀρέσκειν δὲ αὐτὰν τῷ αὐτᾶς ἀνδρὶ ἐπιτελέας ποιεύσαν τὰς ἐκεῖνω θελήσας, lines 19–20). The first requirement stated for the *sōphrōn* wife is the metaphorical “being adorned with silence” (ἀσυχίᾳ κεκαλλωπισμέναν, line 6).⁵ While not every text that treats the *topos* of the “good woman” mentions women’s speech and/or silence, it is common enough in this literature.⁶ For example, in *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, Plutarch holds forth:

καὶ θυμοῦ, ὅσῃ καὶ ἀρμονίᾳ γίγνεται· ὥστε οὐδὲ ἔρωτες αὐτὴν ἄνομοι διώξουσιν, ἀλλ’ ἐς ἀνδρα τε καὶ τέκνα καὶ τὸν οἶκον ξύμπαντα φιλήν ἔξει, Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W.-H. 689.4–7). See also the statement: “For when a woman is loving toward her husband and behaves agreeably, harmony exists, and she loves her household altogether, and makes those outside the doors friendly toward the household,” γυνὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ φίλῃ οὖσα καὶ τὰνδρὸς πρήσσουσα κρηγύως, ἀρμονίᾳ ὑπάρχει, καὶ οἶκον τὸν ξύμπαντα φιλεῖ καὶ τοὺς θύρηθεν εὐνόους τῇ οἰκίᾳ ποιεῖ, Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W.-H. 692.9–11). (My translations of portions of these two texts are from the Wachsmuth-Hense edition of Johannes Stobaeus, *Anthologium*. References are made to the pages and line numbers of this volume.) Musonius Rufus, however, mentions household before marriage and children on the list of a woman’s activities: “Right away, it is necessary for the woman to be skilled in household management and skilled at reckoning the things beneficial for the household and skilled at ruling over the household slaves,” αὐτίκα δεῖ οἰκονομικὴν εἶναι τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐκλογιστικὴν τῶν οἴκῳ συμφερόντων καὶ ἀρχικὴν τῶν οἰκετῶν, Fr. 3 10–12.

⁴ E.g., Phintys, *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman*. Not only does *On the Sōphrosynē* name marital faithfulness as the most prominent quality of feminine *sōphrosynē*, but more lines are devoted to this than to the other displays of *sōphrosynē*.

⁵ See again the discussion of the emendation by Städele in Chapter One, n. 114. Interestingly, Plutarch advises in *On Listening to Lectures*: “In every case, silence is a safe adornment for a young man,” πανταχοῦ μὲν οὖν τῷ νέῳ κόσμος ἀσφαλὴς ἐστίν ἢ σιωπὴ (Mor. 39B). His statement assumes that the young man is in the position of a learner, which is precisely the position of all women in 1 Tim 2:11–12.

⁶ Marianne Bjelland Kartzow examines in detail ancient evidence about the speaking habits of “bad” women in *Gossip and Gender: Othering of Speech in the Pastoral Epistles* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 67–116. The sources she uses include, among others: Semonides, *Frag.* 7, 12–20; Plutarch, *Mor.* 138–146, 502–519; Juvenal, *Satire* 6, xi–lxxx; and Philo, *Spec.* 3.171.

Phidias made [the statue of] Aphrodite at Elis treading on a tortoise, a symbol of house-keeping and of *silence* [here, *σιωπῆς*] for women. For it is necessary [for a wife] to speak with her husband or through her husband, not feeling annoyed if, just like the flute-player, she speaks in a more dignified way through another voice.⁷

The point is that a *sōphrōn* wife will not speak freely and easily, especially with other men, but will essentially cover herself with silence.

The letter moves on to advise that a good wife's marital fidelity is represented by her modest adornment,⁸ delineated as:

clothing that is whitened and clean and simple, but not very expensive or excessive; for she ought to avoid garments of purple cloth, and those that are shot through with purple and gold, since this sort is useful to the *hetairai* for

⁷ Τὴν Ἥλειων ὁ Φειδίας Ἀφροδίτην ἐποίησε χελώνην πατοῦσαν, οἰκουρίας σύμβολον ταῖς γυναίξιν καὶ σιωπῆς. δεῖ γάρ ἢ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα λαλεῖν ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἀνδρός, μὴ δυσχεραίνουσιν εἰ δι' ἄλλοτριᾶς γλώττης ὥσπερ αὐλητῆς φθέγγεται σεμνότερον, *Advice, Mor.* 142C (32). Such a statement recalls the Pauline instruction: "Let the women be silent [σιγάτωσαν] in the assemblies, for I do not permit them to speak If they wish to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home, for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the assembly," αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν· αἰσχρὸν γάρ ἐστιν γυναῖκι λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, 1 Cor 14:34–35. (Cf. also the examples of γλώσσα and φωνία in 14:6 f., including the αὐλός.) For my project, a more important parallel to this line of *Melissa to Kleareta* is found, of course, in 1 Tim 2:11.

⁸ While it is beyond the bounds of this investigation to analyze the many different ancient sources that employ this whole adornment-complex, this would be a worthwhile project for future research. The most comprehensive ancient moral-philosophical treatments (I exclude references from drama, fiction, satire, and poetry) of women's bodily adornment are: Phintys, *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman*, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a (W.-H. 591.15–592.14); Periktione, *On the Harmony of a Woman*, Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W.-H. 689.14–690.19); Plutarch, *Mor.* 139E–F (14); 141C–D (25); 141D–E (26); 142A–B (29); 142C (30); 144D–E (45); 145A (48); 145E (48); Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.10; in the NT, 1 Cor 11:3–16; 1 Tim 2:9–10; 1 Pet 3:3–6. Common elements of "concern" include: *clothing* (its color, design, expense, foreign provenance, transparency); *hairstyle* (braiding, dyeing, loosening); *jewelry* (gold, pearls, emeralds, precious stones); *cosmetics* (foundation, rouge, eye coloring); *perfumes/oils* (foreign provenance); and *food/drink* (expense, foreign provenance). In moral-philosophical writings for and about women, bodily adornment—good and bad—serves as more than simply protecting and/or concealing the female body: actual adornment is relentlessly linked to a woman's presumed morality, her reputation in social settings, and especially her proper sexual behavior. Research on women's clothing, make-up, and hairstyles in Greece and Rome include Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, ed., *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World* (London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2002). Other significant work is that of: Kelly Olson, "Matrona and Whore: The Clothing of Women in Roman Antiquity," *Fashion Theory*, 6:4 (2002): 387–420; Maria Wyke, "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World," in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night* (eds. Léonie J. Archer, Susan Fischler, and Maria Wyke; New York: Routledge, 1994), 134–151; and Iris Young, "Women Recovering Our Clothes," in *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005): 176–188.

their hunting of more men. But the adornment that belongs to the woman who is well pleasing to her very own [husband] is her way of life, and not her robes. For the married woman must appear fair of form to her own husband, but not to the neighbors. On the one hand, you should have a blush as a sign of modesty on your face instead of rouge, and, on the other, goodness and the height of decorum and *sōphrosynē* instead of gold and emeralds.⁹

All these statements consistently assert that a wife's choice of modest physical adornment demonstrates that she is sexually active only with her husband, and is not, as are the *hetairai*, on the hunt for "more men" (lines 10–11).¹⁰

The proposition offered to support this paraenetic statement is that (only one) man has the right to view a woman's fair form (εὖμορφον), and that is

⁹ τῷ ἐσθῶτι λευκοεῖμονα καὶ καθάριον καὶ ἀφελή, ἀλλὰ μὴ πολυτελεῖ καὶ περισσάν· παραιτητέον γὰρ αὐτῇ τὴν ἀλουργή καὶ διαπόρφυρον καὶ τὰ χρυσόπαστα τῶν ἐνδυμάτων ἔχοις ἂν ἐπὶ τῆς ὀψιος ἐρύθασμα μὲν σαμείον αἰδοῦς ἀντὶ φύκιος, καλοκαγαθίαν δὲ καὶ κοσμιότατα καὶ σωφροσύνην ἀντὶ χρυσῶ καὶ σμαράγδω, lines 7–10, 15–17. The paraenesis for a wife's clothing to be "whitened and clean and simple" (λευκοεῖμονα καὶ καθάριον καὶ ἀφελή, line 7) is similar to the instruction given in the Pythagorean treatise by Phintys, *On the Sōphrosynē*: "It is necessary for [her clothing] to be whitened and uncomplicated and without excess," δεῖ λευχεῖμονα εἶναι καὶ ἀπλοικάν καὶ ἀπερίσσευτον, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a (W.-H. 591.16); and further on she advises women to wrap their bodies in clothes, "that are moderate and white in color," μετρίοις καὶ λευκοχρωμάτοις, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a (W.-H. 592.3). Städele notes that λευκοεῖμονα is a variant of λευχεῖμονα which is found in Pythagorean-Orphic texts (*Die Briefe*, 259), but white clothing in and of itself was not restricted to Pythagoreans or to women. Taylor points to the significance of white clothing for festival and ritual occasions generally, and refers to Philo's *Therapeutae*: "... white is the color of purity because it usually indicates that clothing was indeed newly laundered as well as bleached While undyed wool and linen were common as clothing in antiquity, they were not generally considered 'white' unless they were specially treated and clean. It would mean also that you smelt good Philo himself writes of the benefits of linen and associates it, 'when carefully cleaned,' with a 'very bright and luminous colour' (*Somn.* 217). This would indicate that Philo had cleanness in mind also when he wrote of the Mareotic group wearing white" (*Jewish Women Philosophers*, 298, and 296–302).

Artificial make-up is also proscribed in Periktione, *On the Harmony*: "... nor will she make up her face, making it white or red or her eyebrows and eyes black For the woman seeking these things, seeks admirers of feminine lack of self-control," οὐδὲ χρίσεται πρόσωπον λευκαίνουσα ἢ ἐρυθραίνουσα τοῦτο ἢ μελαίνουσα ὀφρύας τε καὶ ὀφθαλμούς καὶ τὴν πολλὴν ἢ γὰρ ταῦτα ζητέουσα θηγήθηρα ζητεῖ ἀκρασίης γυναικίης, Stob., *Anth.* 4.29.19 (W.-H. 690.14–15, 17–18). Cf. also, Phintys, *On the Sōphrosynē*: "And [she must] brighten her face not by an imported and foreign color, but washing her body at home by water itself, and to adorn herself rather with a proper sense of shame, for also she will provide honor both for her life-partner and for herself," χρώματι δὲ φαιδρύνεσθαι τὴν ποτῶπα μὴ ἐπακτῶ καὶ ἀλλοτρίῳ, τῷ δ' οὐκ ἔω τῷ σώματος δι' αὐτῷ τῷ ὕδατος ἀπολουσέμεν, κοσμεῖν δὲ μάλλον αὐτὴν αἰσχύνῃ, καὶ γὰρ τὸν συμβιώντα καὶ αὐτὴν ἐντιμον παρέξεται, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a (W.-H. 592. 11–14).

¹⁰ I examine the function of the *hetaira* as an immoral example at more length in the analysis of *Theano to Nikostrate*.

her husband,¹¹ because her body should not be revealed to “the neighbors” (οἱ πλᾱστοί).¹² This verification reinforces a high sexual standard for the wife, while providing some sly humor about the potential exposure of her body to unspecified other men. If this is a teasing remark, addressed to a newly married (thus presumably newly sexually active) young woman, then the advice that immediately follows—“you should have a blush as a sign of modesty on your face instead of rouge” (lines 15–16)¹³—could continue the bantering tone.

Donald Lateiner’s study, “Blushes and Pallor in Ancient Fictions,”¹⁴ provides a helpful context for this reference to blush (ἐρύθῃμα) in *Melissa to Kleareta* (and to the *hetaira*’s lack of blush [οὐκ ἐρυθριῶσα γυνή] in *Theano to Nikostrate*). Lateiner connects blushing with the terms αἰσχύνῃ and αἰδώς,¹⁵ but more importantly for this analysis, he finds that blushing has a sexual connotation: “Blushes in [ancient] literature usually communicate involuntarily the shyness, modesty, embarrassment, or shame of a man or woman entering into first amatory awareness or of one caught in infidelity.”¹⁶ But this is not at all a negative judgment of the blushing person; rather,

Proper women in the ancient Mediterranean world were expected not to be pert, brassy, or bold. When a woman appeared flustered, she showed spiritual perturbation and a hint of appropriate self-policing, if not repentance. If the cause was a young woman’s emotional fancy or sexual interest, the blush revealed not a character fault—women were expected to welcome marriage, babies, sex, and love (in that order of significance)—but a becoming shyness and modesty in their uncontrollable sentiment¹⁷

¹¹ In this particular context, εὐμορφον appears to be a euphemistic term for the woman’s (nude?) body, or perhaps refers to “form-fitting” clothing that reveals as much as it hides.

¹² This instruction is like Theano’s well-known apophthegm regarding not showing one’s arm to the δημόσια.

¹³ ἔχουσιν ἂν ἐπὶ τὰς ὄψεις ἐρύθῃμα μὲν σαμείον αἰδοῦς ἀντὶ φύκιος, lines 15–16. As cited in n. 22 above, *On the Sôphrosynê* has a very similar idea of facial cosmetics, using αἰσχύνῃ as a synonym for αἰδώς.

¹⁴ *Helios* 25:2 [1998]: 163–189.

¹⁵ “Blushes and Pallor,” 164–165. Natural, i.e., physiological, blushing often seems to arise from the recognition that some social (and, often, sexual) standard has been transgressed, as suggested by Lateiner.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 166.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 169. This understanding goes some way toward explaining the meaning of the word αἰδώς, which, when translated into English as “shame” appears more negative than positive. In the Greco-Roman social world, “shame” is generally a positive thing, as Lateiner states, “A sense of shame is a good and honourable attribute in the eyes of Aristotle and subsequent upholders of the social order” (*ibid.*, 164); and “Blushing has often done a man or, even more, a woman credit. Modesty, a word derived from *modus* or ‘convention of behavior,’

Lateiner's conclusions are relevant to Melissa's comment to Kleareta in at least two ways. First, if we can rely upon the perception that Kleareta is characterized as a young, newlywed woman, then her blushing would be a socially expected response to her changed status from once-chaste virgin to now-sexually-active wife: she is perceived as a woman who has recently crossed the threshold of sexual initiation.¹⁸ And second, the blush "on her face" (ἐπὶ τὰς ὀφθαλμοὺς) is an involuntary, and thus wholly honest, representation of her good internal character, "a sign of her shame" (σημαίνειον αἰδοῦς).¹⁹

Melissa to Kleareta repeats the claim that extravagant outer adornment (including "gold and emeralds"²⁰) is not appropriate for a "woman who

evokes blushes in those it characterizes" (ibid., 167). This is so because when blushing, "The individual communicates awareness to others that his or her group's values and ideology have been insulted or violated. It acknowledges simultaneously social convention and personal transgression. Thus the blush is a kind of apology, if not justification, and all the better for being involuntary and uncontrollable. It serves as its own involuntary proof and guarantee of sincerity" (ibid.).

¹⁸ "Melissa" may be teasing "Kleareta" about this change, in her comment about the neighbors. Lateiner says that "The breach of normal affect-display which we call the blush may be civilly disattended or uncivilly teased. The teaser focuses on both the defect and the blusher's social vulnerability. Thus men more openly tease women, and elders taunt juniors, who are more socially woundable. The teaser acts as society's vicar, fostering embarrassment and social discomfort to promote the internalizing of social anxiety. Blushes are very serviceable as submission tokens and dependable indicators that a teaser has found a suitable topic" (ibid., 169).

¹⁹ The topic of αἰδώς is brought up in two of the other Pythagorean letters. *Myia to Phyllis* includes it on a list of virtues for the wet-nurse, who must be "most well-disposed and clean, and what is more, modest and not associated with sleep and nor indeed with strong drink" lines 3–4. In *Theano to Euboule*, the author says that ideal children ought to show "respect for their peers and their superiors," αἰδῶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν συνηλίκων ἢ τῶν ἐπιστατῶν, lines 36–37. A related word is used for the husband in *Theano to Nikostrate*, whom the author states will eventually come to his senses and "be ashamed" (αἰσχύνεται, line 40).

²⁰ In advice on jewelry it appears that "gold" (χρυσός) is the most often repeated: *Melissa to Kleareta* names "gold and emerald," line 17; *On the Harmony* prohibits "gold and precious stones," χρυσὸν καὶ λίθων (Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 [W.-H. 689.17]), while *On the Sôphrosynê* also mentions "gold and emeralds," χρυσὸν δὲ καὶ σμάραγδον (Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a [W.-H. 592.5–6]). Plutarch rejects gold and emerald and scarlet, οὔτε χρυσὸς οὔτε σμάραγδος οὔτε κόκκος (*Advice, Mor.* 141D–E [26]). Winter provides a few other examples of jewelry lists (*Roman Wives*, 105). There he states somewhat inaccurately that "... the term 'jewellery' [*sic*] epitomised sumptuousness in Roman eyes ..." and quotes Dalby: "This Greek phrase, 'dresses and gold' is the standard statement of the two accoutrements of a *hetaira*" (ibid., 105; my italics). He cites Dalby, "Levels of Concealment: The Dress of *Hetairai* and *Pornai* in Greek Texts" (in *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World* [ed. Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones (London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2002)], 115 in n. 43). However, in that place Dalby previously claims that "... in Rome the combination of 'clothes and gold' had no special resonance ..." (ibid.). Taking this presumed cultural difference into account means that the jewelry paraenesis in these

strives for *sōphrosynē* (τὰν γλιχομένην τὰς σωφροσύνας), and points out that “her orderly behavior” (τὰν εὐταξίαν) is her “best and greatest dowry.”²¹ The letter comes to a graceful close with a renewed urging to focus on inner moral beauty rather than on externals, since the “beauty and wealth of her ‘soul’” (τῷ τὰς ψυχᾶς κάλλει τε καὶ πλούτῳ, lines 24–25) will endure until death, while the beauty and wealth of “her looks and her possessions” (τὰς ὀψιός καὶ τῶν χρημάτων, line 25) are only temporary, being easily affected by “jealousy and illness” (φθόνος καὶ νοῦσος, line 26).²² This expresses the philosophical commonplace that inner moral character is demonstrated in modest outer adornment, which at the same time signifies a wife’s sexual faithfulness to her one and only husband.

In *Melissa to Kleareta*, the feminine virtue of *sōphrosynē* extends to a woman’s domestic context in that “the woman who strives for *sōphrosynē* should not be enthusiastic for the extravagance of clothing, but for the management of her household.”²³ While the main focus of the wife’s *sōphrōn* behavior is her husband, this bit of advice evokes her roles as mother and *despoina*, so that the virtue of *sōphrosynē* becomes visible in every aspect of a “wife’s decorous behavior.”²⁴

I have already noted that this letter’s concentrated attention to *sōphrosynē* for women gives a compelling reason for its lead position in the subcollection *MM*, in *P.Haun.* II.13 and in Composite Collection A. When *Melissa to*

texts derives from the Greek social opinion. Several marriage contracts and divorce documents mention gold jewelry, valuable clothing, and silver drachmae (sometimes stating the value of the items in silver currency). The first group cited comes from *Select Papyri: Private Affairs* (trans. A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar, vol. 1, LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932): *B.G.U.* 1052 and *B.G.U.* 1103 (both 13 BCE); *P. Ryl.* 154 (66 CE); *P. Oxy.* 266 (96 CE); and *P. Oxy.* 1273 (260 CE). P.W. Pestman includes: *P. Eleph.* 1 (310 BCE); *B.G.U.* 1050 (12–11 BCE); and *P. Lips.* 27 (123 CE) (*The New Papyrological Primer*, 2nd ed. rev.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994]). Lefkowitz and Fant also offer a draft of a dowry payment, *P. Mich.* 6551 (143 CE), that specific receipt of forty silver drachmas and twenty drachmas of a white chiton (*Women’s Life*, 121).

²¹ προῖκα ... καλλίσταν καὶ μεγίσταν, lines 23–24.

²² A similar sentiment about the transitory nature of material wealth is expressed by Jesus in Mt 6:19–21 (where “moth and rust” [σῆς καὶ βρώσις] are the culprits), and //Lk 12:33–34 (“thief” and “moth” [χλέπτης ... σῆς]), as well as in 1Tim 6:17–19, which says that riches are “uncertain” (ἀδηλόγητι), and focuses on the “good foundation for the future” (θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον).

²³ οὐ γὰρ ἐς τὰν τὰς ἐσθῶτος πολυτέλειαν φιλοκαλεῖν δεῖ τὰν γλιχομένην τὰς σωφροσύνας, ἀλλ’ ἐς τὰν οἰκονομίαν τῷ οἴκῳ, lines 17–19. Outside the Pythagorean women’s letters, advice on women’s domestic roles is also treated in most of the same texts already mentioned in relation to adornment: Periktione, *On the Harmonia*; Phintys, *On the Sōphrosynē*; Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 10.2–13; Plutarch, *Advice*; Musonius Rufus, *Fr.* 3; and in the NT: 1Cor 7:1–16, 25–40; Eph 5:22; Col 3:18; 1Tim 2:9–15; 3:11; 5:3–16; Titus 2:3–5; 1Pet 3:1–6.

²⁴ γυναικὸς εὐκοσμίας, lines 3–4; or, “her orderly behavior,” τὰν εὐταξίαν, lines 23–24.

Kleareta is read as “programmatically” for these collections,²⁵ then we read the occasion of *Melissa to Kleareta* as “advice to a young bride,” after which we have “advice on mothering” found in either the letter *Theano to Euboule* (in the case of *P.Haun.* II.13) or *Myia to Phyllis* (in the codices). Greco-Roman social convention would certainly dictate this sequence of events: a (free) woman ought to be married *before* she has children so that the children will be the legitimate children of her lawful husband; therefore a woman needs to know how to be a *sōphrōn* wife before she learns how to be a *sōphrōn* mother. Second, and perhaps more importantly, the letter’s emphasis on feminine *sōphrosynē* provides the lens for reading the entire collection as a full explication of that moral virtue to be acquired by women. A woman enacts *sōphrosynē* first and foremost in her marital faithfulness, which is shown in her modest adornment. Looking ahead to the other four letters, we also ought to find that virtue manifested in her childrearing and household management.

The letter’s subject matter of a feminine kind of *sōphrosynē*, then, is cleverly supported by the authorial pseudonym: Μέλισσα. First, there is the connection of honey-bees, *melissai*, with Pythagoreans in Porphyry’s account, so that whatever advice is given here has received the imprimatur of that esteemed philosophical movement. Second, there are the reports of the sexual purity of bees, their chastity and hatred of luxury and of licentious intercourse, all of which correspond to the paraenesis of this letter. Consequently, the name again reinforces the epistolary contents (while also pointing to an exemplary woman worthy of imitation). Third, there is the strong connection of bee-society to the human household, with a queen-bee in charge of the others, and responsible for maintaining the efficiency and welfare of the hive. In this way the name “Melissa” brings to mind the whole household, so that, in addition to the brief mention of household management, its programmatic significance extends to the other letters in the collection that take up the woman’s roles as mother and *despoina*.

My analysis of *Melissa to Kleareta* makes clear the deep interconnectedness of the components—textual resource, pseudonymous teachers, instructional methods, and necessary subject matter—of what I have designated as a moral-philosophical curriculum for women. The position of the letter within a collection, its ascription to a famous philosophical female name, the rhetorical strategies it uses to provide paraenesis, and its topic

²⁵ See again Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 264.

of virtue of a feminine type all work together to make a brief but comprehensive statement not only about what moral progress looked like for a woman in the Greco-Roman world, but also the means by which it might be achieved: by reading instructional texts and following the advice and examples of female models of virtue.

SUBJECT MATTER: MYIA TO PHYLLIS

The subject matter of childrearing is a topic addressed in many other moral-philosophical texts. Here, the particular epistolary occasion of *Myia to Phyllis* is constructed as a major life event, one longed-for and shared by many women then and now: the birth of one's first child. That marriage would lead to children is the assumption of most ancient moral-philosophical sources, including the letters under investigation here.²⁶ The issue surfaces in philosophical debates about the benefits and drawbacks of marriage, because, as Deming states:

Marriage joined a man socially and financially to another human being, his wife But marriage also meant accepting the responsibilities of a father, householder, and a citizen. This is because marriage in the ancient world almost always resulted in the birth of children. In marrying, a man thus obligated himself to providing for a family. He would need to raise and educate children²⁷

²⁶ For further discussion of the links between marriage and children, with references to key sources, see Jane F. Gardner and Thomas Wiedemann, *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook* (New York; London: Routledge, 1991), ch. 5: "The life-cycle"; Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, 49–51, 76, 78–80, 211–212, and especially the text and his translations of the excerpt of Antipater of Tarsus' *On Marriage*, 221–229, and of Ocellus Lucanus' *On the Nature of the Universe*, 231–237. Other citations are found in Malherbe, "The *Virtus Femininarum*," 63–64. References to other early Christian literature on the subject are provided by Osiek and Balch, *Families in the NT World*, 149–152. For socio-historical perspectives, see Dixon, *The Roman Family* (chs. 3 and 4); Richard P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994; repr. 1996), ch. 2: "Roman Patterns of Death, Marriage and Birth." Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald describe the social realities of women's child-bearing and childrearing in the Roman Empire (*A Woman's Place*, 20–26), and apply this to Christian groups in their ch. 3: "Giving Birth: Labor, Nursing, and the Care of Infants in House-church Communities," and ch. 4: "Growing Up in House-church Communities."

²⁷ Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, 49. Deming continues with this remark: "... he would need to establish a household (οἶκος, οἰκία), a financial endeavor that was the ancient world's ideal of a small business; and he would need to become active in the social, political, and economic life of his hometown, since a household could not survive without the political protection and economic environment provided by the Greek city-state (πόλις)" (ibid., 49–50).

Since the married man was expected to become a father, of course, his lawful wife was expected to bear his legitimate children.²⁸ Thus, a second step toward adulthood for a woman, after she is married, is to begin bearing children. This mothering role is also carefully linked to a woman's *sōphrosynē*, her adornment, and her marital faithfulness, because, as Phin-tys' *On the Sōphrosynē* so bluntly states:

But the best adornment and foremost glory of a free woman is that her *sōphrosynē* toward her husband is testified to through her children, if they bear the image of the likeness of the father who begot them.²⁹

In an age before blood-typing and DNA testing, how else was a man to know if the children his wife bore were really engendered by him and not by some other man? *On the Sōphrosynē* explicitly connects feminine virtue to a (free) woman's role as child-bearer of legitimate children for the family patriarch.³⁰

²⁸ The primary sources are unanimous in their understanding that only legal marriages, i.e., between two free persons, resulted in legitimate children. For instance, Plutarch advises fathers against sexual intercourse with *hetairai* and mistresses (παλλακαί) in order to provide a child with an honorable birth (εὐγένεια), *Education of Children* 1B (2). (The authorship of this text is debated.) However, the reality was probably quite different, presenting other kinds of family constellations. Dale B. Martin investigates "the variety of social structures in which slaves maintained 'families' themselves and played what we might call familial roles in the households of others" ("Slave Families and Slaves in Families," in *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, eds. David L. Balch and Carolyn Osiek; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003: 207–230, here 208). Martin asks: "How do we think about the reality of ancient slavery and family when we realize that a slave could sometimes be treated as a spouse, a parent, a child, a brother or sister, or even a 'patron' or 'client' of someone else (either another slave or a nonslave)?" (ibid., 207–208). Using funerary inscriptional evidence from Asia Minor, Martin sketches a portrait of slaves forming "nuclear families" of husband-wife-children, even though these were not initiated by legally-sanctioned marriages (ibid., 209). He notes the inscriptions that seem to indicate "mixed households," "in which some members are free or freed while others are slaves and in which members do not all belong to the same household" (ibid., 214, and through 222). As for their children, "... offspring of a slave couple would be officially children of the woman but not the man. But male slaves in these inscriptions often *do* call their children just that: their own children" (ibid., 212).

²⁹ κάλλιστος δὲ κόσμος γυναικὸς ἐλευθέρας πρᾶτόν τε κύδος τὸ διὰ τῶν αὐτὰς τέκνων ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι τὴν σωφροσύνην τὴν ποτὶ τὸν ἄνδρα, αἶκα τὸν τύπον τᾶς ὁμοιότητος ἐπιφέρωντι τῷ κατασπείραντος αὐτὰ πατρός, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a (59.11–15).

³⁰ Since under Roman law it was children, and not wives, who inherited from the *paterfamilias*, the desire for children had a special significance for male property-owners. For further discussion of the social need for legitimate descendants who could inherit property, see again Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death*, part III, "The Devolution of Property in the Roman Family." Here he examines legal evidence for "strategies of succession," concluding that "the Roman law of succession provided testators with a remarkable array of options in distributing their property, unstructured by conventions of primogeniture or ultimogeniture" (ibid., 161–162). In fact, "a substantial fraction of the property [in the Empire] was owned by chil-

The author of *Myia to Phyllis* constructs a situation where a new mother would receive counsel from a more experienced woman (assumed to also be a mother) in how to feed, dress, bathe, and put this newborn child to sleep,³¹ but first of all in how to engage the services of a wet-nurse (τῖτθαν).³² In the Greco-Roman world, for many women of some economic means the birth of a child often entailed the hiring of such a wet-nurse, as shown in several documentary papyri.³³ Yet the practice was criticized by some writers,³⁴ as Soranus lectures:

dren and managed by guardians ..." (ibid., 229; this topic is treated more fully there in ch. 8, "Guardianship of Roman Children," 181–203). See also Gardner and Wiedemann, *The Roman Household*, ch. VI, "Inheritance," 117–143.

³¹ Comparing the content of this letter with that of *Theano to Euboule*, it is evident that the advice here is tailored to the special needs of an infant, and not to those of an older child. If "Myia" had written a subsequent letter to a mother of an older child, it would probably have touched on the issues addressed by "Theano." Thus, *Theano to Euboule* in Composite A (MM→TH3) is nicely positioned after *Myia to Phyllis*.

³² For a brief discussion of the difference between a τῖτθαν (wet-nurse) and a τροφός (child-nurse), see Louise Pratt, "The Old Women of Ancient Greece and the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*" (*Transactions of the American Philological Association* 130 [2000], 46). Noting that the distinction is not universally maintained, she says, "In some cases, it seems that a woman who began as a wet nurse (*tittheus*) remained in the house after menopause, when she came to serve a more ambiguous but also more elevated position as a *trophos*" (ibid., 46, and n. 7). However, Pestman's examples of Hellenistic and Roman papyrus documents regarding services and wages of a wet-nurse use τροφ-cognates (*The New Papyrological Primer*, #s 13, 17, 26); the same is true of two papyri (#s 16 and 79) printed in *Select Papyri, Private Affairs*. Cf. also Bradley's investigation of the inscriptional evidence on the *nutrix* (Latin for "wet-nurse") in *Discovering the Roman Family: Studies in Roman Social History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), ch. 2: "The Social Role of the Nurse in the Roman World," 13–36.

³³ Five documents mentioning wet-nurses have been published. Three are found in Pestman, *New Papyrological Primer*: (1) *B.G.U.* 4.1107 (dated 13 B.C.E) involves an agreement for the services of a wet-nurse for an exposed baby (a 16-month commitment); (2) *P.Oxy.* 1.37 (49 CE) reports a trial of a wet-nurse whose charge died while in her care; (3) *P.Mich.* 3.202 (105 CE) is a letter where one Valeria writes to persuade another woman to serve as a wet-nurse. Volume 1 of *Select Papyri: Private Affairs* includes *B.G.U.* 1107, along with *P.Oxy.* 91 (187 CE), a receipt of wages signed by a slave-owner whose female slave nursed a baby girl for another woman. Bagnall and Cribiore translate and discuss *P.Mich.* 3.202 as well as *P.Lond.* 3.951 verso (250–300 CE), a letter from a woman urging her son-in-law to hire a wet-nurse for her daughter who has just given birth (*Women's Letters*, 76–77, 265–266, 359–360). Lefkowitz and Fant include an excerpt from *P.Lond.* 3.951 verso in *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, 188 (#252).

³⁴ Städele cites various sources dealing with wet-nurses, including: Rufus of Ephesus, περὶ ἐκλογῆς τῖτθῆς; Galen, *San. Tuenda*; Tacitus, *Dialogue* and *Germania*; Quintilian, *Institute*; Favorinus, in Aulus Gellius, 12.1. The discourse of Favorinus was reported in Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights* 12.1 (ca. 150 CE). Favorinus goes to visit a student whose wife has just given birth, and he debates the matter with the husband and the mother of the woman (but not the woman herself!), saying, "I have no doubt ... that she will nurse the baby with her own milk." But when the girl's mother said that her daughter should be spared this and nurses

For it is better, other things being equal, for the infant to be nourished with mother's milk, for this is more proper for him/her, and their mothers become more sympathetic towards their offspring, and as it is more natural to be nourished from the mother before childbirth, thus also after childbirth.³⁵

Soranus sees that it is not just that mother's milk is more proper for the child, but that the process of nursing encourages the mother-child relationship.

Further, nursing one's own child was viewed as a sign of female virtue. Plutarch praises his wife Timoxena for doing just that for their son Chaeron, even though it caused her considerable pain: "And yet at your own breast you had nursed him, and you bore up when you had surgery for a bruise on the nipple. These things indeed were noble and loving."³⁶ And yet, it

provided—so as not to add the burdensome and difficult task of nursing to the pains of childbirth' [sic], he said, 'I pray you, woman, let her be completely the mother of her own child. What sort of half-baked, unnatural kind of mother bears a child and then sends it away? To have nourished in her womb with her own blood something she could not see, and now that she can see it not to feed it with her own milk, now that it's alive and human, crying for its mother's attentions? ... And furthermore who could forget or belittle that those who desert their newborn and send them away to be fed by others cut or at least loosen the bond and that joining of mind and love by which nature links parents to their children ...' (trans. Maureen Fant, in *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, 188–189 [#253]). Perhaps women who were mothers themselves were more likely to understand the rigors of nursing. In the late third century CE, a woman's mother sent a letter to her son-in-law: "I hear that you are compelling her to nurse. If she wants, let the infant have a nurse, for I do not permit my daughter to nurse" (*PLond.* 3.951, included and translated by Bagnall and Cribiore [*Women's Letters*, 265–266]). It seems that nursing one's child was both viewed as a sign of maternal love but also as somewhat servile, as seen in the evidence cited in the next several footnotes.

³⁵ ἄμεινον γάρ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπ' ἴσης ἔχόντων τῷ μητρῷ γάλακτι τρέφεσθαι τὸ νήπιον· τοῦτο γάρ οἰκειότερον αὐτῷ, καὶ πρὸς τὰ γεννηθέντα συμπαθέστεραι μᾶλλον αἱ μητέρες γίνονται, καὶ φυσικώτερον ὡς πρὸ τῆς ἀποτέξεως οὕτως καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀπότεξιν ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς τρέφεσθαι, *Gyn.* 2.18.4. Plutarch (or Ps.-Plutarch) expresses the same view: "It is necessary, as I would say, for mothers to feed their children and to sustain them from their own breasts. For they will nourish them more affectionately and through more care, since they love their children from within and as it is said, from the fingernails And also nature makes clear that it is necessary for mothers to nurse and to nourish the children they have borne; for this reason (nature) has provided the nourishment of milk for every animal that gives birth," δει δέ, ὡς ἐγὼ ἂν φαίην, αὐτὰς τὰς μητέρας τὰ τέκνα τρέφειν καὶ τούτοις τοὺς μαστοὺς ὑπέχειν· συμπαθέστερόν τε γὰρ θρέψουσιν καὶ διὰ πλείονος ἐπιμελείας, ὡς ἂν ἔνδοθεν καὶ τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀγαπᾶσαι τὰ τέκνα δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ φύσις ὅτι δεῖ τὰς μητέρας ἃ γεγεννηκάσιν αὐτὰς τιθεύειν καὶ τρέφειν· διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο παντὶ ζῷῳ τεκόντι τὴν ἐκ τοῦ γάλακτος τροφὴν ἐχορήγεσε, *Educ., Mor.* 3C (5).

³⁶ καίτοι τῷ σεαυτῆς ἐκέκινον ἐξέθρεψας μαστῷ καὶ τομῇς ἡνέσχου τῆς θηλῆς περίθλασιν λαβοῦσης· γενναία γάρ ταῦτα καὶ φιλόστοργα, *A Consolation to His Wife, Mor.* 609E. In a similar vein, Lefkowitz and Fant cite a Latin inscription: "Of Graxia Alexandria, distinguished for her virtue and fidelity. She nursed her children with her own breasts. Her husband Pudens the emperor's freedman [dedicated this monument] as a reward to her. She lived 24 years, 3 months, 16 days" (*Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, 188 [#251]).

was recognized that such physical problems as Timoxena evidently suffered could interrupt the intimacy of the mother-child nursing bond, so that Soranus allows: “but if something hinders, [one should] select the best wet-nurse, so that the mother might not grow old prematurely being consumed through the day-to-day suckling.”³⁷

However, the choice of a wet-nurse was believed to have implications for the child's moral development, since the medical texts attest that a woman's milk conveys not only simple nourishment but also the mother's very being.³⁸ This is most vividly described by Favorinus:

“But it's not important,” I hear said, “as long as the baby is alive and well-fed whose milk it drinks.” Why then does not the same person also think, if he understands so little of nature, that it doesn't matter in whose body a human being is formed? Or because the blood has turned white in the presence of plentiful air and heat, is it not the same in the breasts as in the womb? ... [I]t is not wrong to believe that, just as the force and nature of the seed is able to create similarities of body and mind [between parents and children], the qualities and properties of milk assist in the same endeavor Why in heaven's name corrupt that nobility of body and mind of the newborn human being, which was off to a fine start, with the alien and degraded food of the milk of a stranger? Especially if the person you use to supply milk is, as is often the case, from a foreign and barbarian nation, or if she is dishonest, or ugly, or immodest, or unchaste, or a drinker; usually the only qualification for that post is that of having milk.³⁹

³⁷ κωλύοντος δέ τις τὴν ἀρίστην ἐκλέγειν τιτθῆν, ὥστε μὴδὲ τὴν μητέρα προγηράσαι διὰ τῆς ἐκμυζήσεως καθ' ἡμέραν δαπανωμένην ἢ μέραν δαπανωμένην, *Gyn.* 2.5. Plutarch (or Ps.-Plutarch) too makes allowances for the mother's health: “but if she [the mother] has a disability or a weakness of the body (for such a thing might happen) or if they are keen for bearing another child, then wet-nurses and foster-mothers are not just come upon, but she must be approved with the most serious effort,” *Educ. Mor.* 3D (5).

³⁸ Favorinus traces this influence back to the child's father: “The disposition of the nurse and the quality of the milk play a great role in character development; the milk is, from the beginning, tinged with the father's seed, and affects the baby from the mother's mind and body as well,” Aulus Gellius, 12.20 (trans. Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, 188–189 [#253]).

³⁹ 12.10–12, 17. Translation from Fant, supplemented by Neil W. Bernstein, and found at www.stoa.org/diotima/anthology/aulgell_12.1.shtml. Favorinus also worried that a wet-nurse would interrupt the bonds of familial affection. Dixon notes, “The philosopher Favorinus argued against wet-nursing because it could divert the affections that belonged properly to relations between parent and child, but it was clearly usual for elite children to grow up surrounded by a variety of such caregivers, especially in early childhood. Slave children, too, might be assigned to nurses or other *educatores* to release their mothers for work, and the free poor seem also to have used foster parents and babysitters to some extent” (*The Roman Family*, 118–119).

Although Favorinus never swerves from his position, for Soranus it follows then that if one *must* “choose”⁴⁰ a wet-nurse, then, the nurse’s good behavior and reputation become pre-requisites for the job. Soranus goes into great detail about the preferred body-type for a wet-nurse, but he also provides a list of ethical traits that the wet-nurse should exhibit: “one must select a wet-nurse who is ... *sōphrōn*, sympathetic and not bad-tempered, Greek, clean.”⁴¹ The four terms employed here are also found in *Myia to Phyllis*: *σώφρων*, *Ἑλληνίς*, *καθάριος*, and *ἀόργιστος*. However, the adjectives in the letter occur in an order different from that of Soranus,⁴² and *Myia to Phyllis* adds a few qualifications for the role of wet-nurse: *ἐπιταδαιοτάταν* (“most well-disposed”) is linked to *καθάριος*, followed by *αἰδύμονα* (“modest”), which is joined to *καὶ μὴ ὕπνω προσοικειουμένην μηδὲ μὲν μέθῃ* (“and not predisposed toward sleep nor indeed toward strong drink”).⁴³

Soranus elaborates on each of these characteristics:

- (1) being *sōphrōn* has two components: to refrain from sexual intercourse and from drinking alcohol,⁴⁴

⁴⁰ The root is *ἐκλεγ-* in both the *Gynaecology* and *Myia to Phyllis*. This section (19) in the *Gyn.* is titled: *Περὶ ἐκλογῆς τιτθῆς*.

⁴¹ *Ἐκλεκτέον δὲ τὴν τιτθὴν ... σώφρονα, συμπαθῆ καὶ ἀόργιστον, Ἑλληνίδα, καθάριον, Gyn. 19.1.* What I have ellipsed is a physical description of the best wet-nurse: neither too young nor too old, a healthy woman, having symmetrical breasts (*μαστοὺς ἔχουσιν συμμετρους*), etc. The five character traits are placed at the end of this list. For Städele, the near parallels of *Myia to Phyllis* to the medical texts suggest a date of sometime in the (late?) second c. CE (*Die Briefe*, 269).

⁴² Neither do they form a simple (mostly asyndetic) list that is then explicated in order, as in the *Gynaecology* (although Soranus has reversed *Ἑλληνίς*, *καθάριος* in his explanation). Instead, the style of *Myia to Phyllis* is more discursive, sprinkling the virtues and vices throughout.

⁴³ Of course, a wet-nurse who drinks too much and sleeps too soundly has been already rejected by Soranus.

⁴⁴ “And *sōphrōn*: refraining from sexual intercourse, drinking, lust, and any other pleasure and lack of self-control. For, on the one hand, sex acts cool her affection for the nursing child by causing [μετά with the genitive denoting “joint efficient cause” (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §169.1)] a distraction of the sexual pleasures, while also ruining the milk and decreasing or making it disappear completely, through provoking the mother’s cleansing or accomplishing conception. And in turn, with regard to drinking, first the one producing milk is harmed both in soul and in body, and for this reason the milk is spoiled. Second, being controlled by a sleep which is difficult to wake from, the infant is left uncared for or she even falls on it in a dangerous way. Third, too much wine is transferred into the milk, and because of this the nursing infant becomes sluggish and drowsy, even trembling and apoplectic and spasmodic,” *σώφρονα δέ, πρὸς τὸ συνουσίας ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ μέθης καὶ λαγνείας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἡδονῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. αἱ συνουσίαι μὲν γὰρ μετὰ τοῦ τὴν πρὸς το τρεφόμενον φιλοστοργίαν ἀποψύχειν περιπαυρῶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἡδονῆς ἔτι καὶ φθείρουσι τὸ γάλα καὶ μειοῦσιν ἢ τελείως ἀφανίζουσιν, τὰς δὲ τῆς μήτρας ἐρεθίζουσιν καθάρσεις ἢ συλλήψεις ἀποτελοῦσαι. διὰ δὲ τὰς μέθας*

- (2) being “sympathetic and not bad-tempered” means being attentive to the child’s needs, for example, picking it up when it cries and changing its position. An angry nurse passes on her disposition to the baby, and may even abuse the child;⁴⁵
- (3) Soranus describes “being neat” next, and here it seems to mean that the wet-nurse’s cleanliness will also keep the child and its swaddling clothes clean;⁴⁶
- (4) the need for a Greek-speaking nurse is simply stated: “because of the fact that the nursling be accustomed to the best dialect by her.”⁴⁷

What is striking in these two sources that discuss hiring a wet-nurse is that such “working women”⁴⁸ are expected to demonstrate the same feminine virtues as those women whose wealth would allow them to hire a surrogate nurse. According to Soranus and *Myia to Phyllis*, it seems that *any woman* could potentially display *sōphrosynē*, especially in the form of chaste sexuality. *Any woman* could learn self-control, and refrain from drinking alcohol,

πρώτον μὲν ἢ γαλουχοῦσα βλάπτεται καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τῷ σώματι, διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τὸ γάλα διαφθείρει· δεύτερον δὲ ὕπνῳ δυσδιεγέρτῳ κατεχομένη καταλείπει τὸ βρέφος ἀνεπιμέλητον ἢ καὶ κινδυνωδῶς ἐπ’ αὐτῷ καταπίπτει· τρίτον ἢ τοῦ πλείονος οἴνου ποιότης συναναδίδοται τῷ γάλακτι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο νωθρὰ καὶ καρῶδη, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἔντρομα καὶ ἀπόπληκτα καὶ σπασμώδη τὰ τρεφόμενα γίνονται βρέφη, *Gyn.* 2.19.11–12. Interestingly, one of the papyrus documents specifies similar appropriate behavior on the part of the wet-nurse. *B.G.U.* 1107 states that while under contract to nurse a foundling, a certain Didyma will “take care of both herself and the child, not spoiling her milk nor sleeping with a man nor becoming pregnant again ...,” τὴν τε ἐατῆς καὶ τοῦ παιδίου ἐπιμέλησαν μὴ φθεῖρουσαν τὸ γάλα μὴδ’ ἀνδροκαίτουσαν μὴδ’ ἐπικούουσιν, *B.G.U.* 1107.

⁴⁵ *Gyn.* 2.19.13–14.

⁴⁶ “It is necessary for the wet-nurse to be neat, so that the infant’s stomach might not be weakened on account of the odor of the swaddling cloths, [so that] it lies awake on account of the itching or endures some subsequent ulceration,” καθάριον δὲ δεῖ εἶναι τὴν τιτθὴν, ἵνα μὴ διὰ τὴν τῶν σπαργάνων ὀσμὴν ὁ στόμαχος ἐκλύηται τῶν νηπίων ἀγρυπνῇ τε διὰ τοὺς ὀδαξισμούς ἢ τιν’ ὕστερον ἔλκωσιν ὑπομένη, *Gyn.* 2.19.15.

⁴⁷ Ἑλληνίδα δέ, χάριν τοῦ τῇ καλλίστῃ διαλέκτῳ ἐθισθῆναι τὸ τρεφόμενον ὑπ’ αὐτῆς. *Gyn.* 2.19.15. Plutarch shows that the language of the wet-nurses is a cultural indicator: “First of all they must be Greek in character,” πρῶτον μὲν τοῖς ἡθεσιν Ἑλληνίδας, *Educ.* 3E (5); this discourse then moves on quickly to consider slave-child minders and pedagogues (παιδαγωγοί), who also must be Greek, and especially able to speak Greek, *Educ.* 3F–4A (5–6), and then to the selection of teachers, who are likened to “farmers” who cultivate children, *Educ.* 4C–5A (7).

⁴⁸ Surely these wet-nurses are not of high social status, since *Myia to Phyllis* contrasts them with “free children,” ἐλευθέρως παῖδας, in lines 5–6. In fact, some wet-nurses were slaves, as Jennifer A. Glancy observes: “In wealthy households that included a number of slaves, a wet nurse could be chosen from among the existing slaves, or a new slave purchased to serve as a wet nurse” (*Slavery In Early Christianity* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006], 19). A household could also contract for the temporary services of a wet-nurse, who might be either a free woman or a slave. In the latter case, her owner is named in the contract as recipient of the wages as evidenced in P. Oxy. 91 (see n. 33 above).

from too much talking, and from angry emotional outbursts.⁴⁹ Perhaps there was some lesser grade of *sōphrosynē* that was recognized as more appropriate for freed or slave women,⁵⁰ a possibility that these texts do not clarify for us. For example, if a woman could not even be legally married, what standard should be used to evaluate her sexual virtue? She obviously was sexually active with a man at one time, since she needs to be lactating from a pregnancy of her own. But now the instruction is given that the wet-nurse should “abstain from sexual intercourse,” or, as *Myia to Phyllis* has it, “is not easily overcome by bedding with a man.”⁵¹ Even so, the intense cultural affirmation of feminine *sōphrosynē* appears to extend to women of lower social levels, especially to women taking on various child-minding roles.

On the other hand, when a new mother read and reflected on the advice of *Myia to Phyllis* about what kind of wet-nurse to employ, she herself was also reminded to demonstrate these same prescribed virtues. In this way, the paraenetic letter serves double-duty: as a description of job qualifications for the wet-nurse *and* also as reinforcement of the expectation that *all* women must continually exhibit *sōphrosynē* in their social interactions. The good moral character of the wet-nurse supports and reflects upon the good moral character of the mother and helps to define the moral training performed by the mother on behalf of her infant child. In this way, the *sōphrōn* behavior of both women serves as an example for the children, whether male or female.⁵² Furthermore, the virtue of both the wet-nurse and mother would add to the reputation of the entire household.

⁴⁹ To change her “dialect” from barbarian to Greek would be more difficult, as *Myia to Phyllis* seems to acknowledge.

⁵⁰ Evaluation of the virtue of a female slave creates a tension of perception, since, as Glancy states succinctly, “Sexual access to slave bodies was a pervasive dimension of ancient systems of slavery. Both female and male slaves were available for their owners’ pleasure” (*Slavery in Early Christianity*, 21). Thus, how could a female slave *ever* be *sōphrōn*, as these sources advise? Osiek and MacDonald concur with Glancy: “To the female slave therefore, honor, whether of character or of behavior, cannot be ascribed. The female slave can lay no claim to chastity or shame, both of which have no meaning. In the official view, she cannot have sensitivity toward chastity” (*A Woman’s Place*, 97). Yet that is exactly what Soranus and *Myia to Phyllis* expect: “sensitivity toward chastity.” These authors advise as though it rests entirely on the woman’s virtue, avoiding the role of her male partner (including the husband).

⁵¹ Would this apply even to the husband of a wet-nurse? Or is it meant to imply that such a woman would have loose sexual morals? Also, although some wet-nurses contracted to take slave-children into their own homes for nursing, perhaps a wet-nurse *within* the household also was viewed as yet another potential sexual partner for the master of the house.

⁵² As already discussed, Favorinus believed that the *sōphrosynē* of the wet-nurse is literally transmitted through her milk.

The last half of *Myia to Phyllis* seems in part to advise the mother on the practices of a good wet-nurse, but the paraenesis also widens to include instructions on how to arrange the child's physical environment. The letter prescribes "proportion" (συμμετρία) as most desirable in air and water temperatures (for drinking and bathing) as well as in bedding.⁵³ Like the qualifications of the wet-nurse, the instructions for infant care can also be extrapolated to the activities of the wet-nurse as well as to the behavior of the new mother: in this household, *everyone* should "yearn for what suits [nature], but not what is extravagant."⁵⁴ The development of self-control ought to begin at a very early age and increase throughout one's life. The author believes that it is crucial for "Phyllis" to grasp this aspect of childrearing, so "acceptable and suitable reminders" (τὰς ἐνδεχομένας καὶ ποτεοικυίας ... ὑπομνάσεις) will arrive as the child grows up.

As with "Melissa", the pseudonym "Myia" accentuates the contents of this letter by adding a Pythagorean authority to the instructions; this is especially true because she is one of Pythagoras' own children.⁵⁵ A reader would have expected the legendary Myia to have been educated in philosophy⁵⁶ and therefore presumably literate enough to compose a letter treating the moral-philosophical *topos* of childrearing. The attestation of Myia "leading" the young women of Croton finds a textual manifestation in this paraenetic letter to Phyllis, who was supposedly a new and, therefore, young mother. From this epistolary occasion, *Myia to Phyllis* creates an instructional process designed for women, one that relies upon a female philosopher who teaches female learners how to apply the principles of moral philosophy to their particular female life-situations. The letter, therefore, does not simply

⁵³ This is supported by the appeal to "nature" (φύσις) which "yearns for what is fitting, but not what is extravagant," lines 30–31. "Extravagant" clothing has already been rejected in *Melissa to Kleareta*. The concern for maintaining proportion in the discipline of older children continues in the next letter to be considered, *Theano to Euboule*.

⁵⁴ τὸ οἰκεῖον ... ἐπιποθεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ πολυτελές, lines 30–31.

⁵⁵ Again, the Doricized Greek of this letter likewise connects it to the Neopythagorean tradition. That other Pythagorean texts address household matters, and childrearing (but, evidently, not infant care) also situates the letter in its philosophical context.

⁵⁶ The invocation of *συμμετρία* may also be meant to signify a Pythagorean origin for the letter, since that term is used in Pseudopythagorean treatises. Although *Myia to Phyllis* does not refer explicitly to the "proportion" of passions, according to Thom, "... the Pseudopythagorean authors [here, Metopus, *De virt.* and Theages, *De virt.*] not only favor the Aristotelian ideal of *μετριοπάθεια*, moderation of the passions, but indeed strongly oppose the Stoic *ἀπάθεια*, which entails the elimination of the passions. Virtue is viewed as the mean (*μεσότης*) between the vices of deficiency and excess, or as the 'due proportion' (*συμμετρία*) of passions" ("The Passions in Neopythagorean Writings," 69).

concern the selection of a *sōphrōn* wet-nurse, but how *every* female member of the household may progress in virtue and thus add to the good reputation of that household.

SUBJECT MATTER: THEANO TO EUBOULE

The epistolary occasion of *Theano to Euboule* takes up the mothering element of the *topos* of “the good woman”, this time through the realistic fiction of a mother who is “spoiling”⁵⁷ her children: her children are not being trained to exercise their proper moral-philosophical capacities, nor is the mother developing her own moral excellence.⁵⁸ Unlike the *flattering* mother (κολακευούσης, lines 4–5), a *good* mother (ἀγαθῆς μητρός, lines 2–3) and a *loving* one (φιλούσης, line 4) is a mother who guides her children toward a *sōphrōn* way of life (ἡ πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον ἀγωγή, lines 3–4). The children will then exhibit *sōphrosynē* by means of: “honoring noble things above all else” (τὰ καλὰ πρὸ πάντων τιμῶσιν, line 14), and bearing “shame from their peers and their superiors” (αἰδῶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν συνηλικίων ἢ τῶν ἐπιστατῶν, lines 36–37). Then they will “be noble in soul” (γεννικὰ εἶναι ... κατὰ ψυχὴν, line 37), and their “virtue will be perfected” (τελειωθησομένης ἀρετῆς, line 39).⁵⁹ These children must be trained to exhibit *sōphrosynē*, rather than to revel in the vices related to failings in self-control with regard to food, drink, luxury, warmth, and mischievous childishness. Although Euboule herself is never explicitly said to be lacking in *sōphrosynē*, her children’s behavior is a visible manifestation of her own virtuous character; we can assume that her practice of indulgent mothering means that she collaborates, even colludes, in

⁵⁷ “Spoiling” is an appropriate term here, since the last line has to do with fruit that gets “spoiled.”

⁵⁸ See *Aristippus to Arete* Chapter Three, n. 15 above for evidence of another mother teaching φιλοσοφία to her son.

⁵⁹ As in other moral philosophical texts, *sōphrosynē* appears in the Pythagorean letters alongside other virtues, and likewise is opposed to certain vices. Positive qualities that cohere to *sōphrosynē* include: virtue (ἀρετή), goodness (καλοκάγαθία/ἀγαθωσύνη), shame/modesty (αἰδώς), and various combinations of cognates of κοσμεῖν, and τάσσειν. On the other hand, for example, North notes “The wide scope of sophrosyne in Plutarch’s usage is betrayed by its numerous antitheses; in addition to the familiar *akolasia*, *mania*, and *hybris*, we find *ataxia* (‘disorder’), *terpnon* (‘sensual pleasure’), *asōtia* (‘drunkenness’), *philédonia* (‘love of pleasure’), *erōtikon* (‘the erotic’), and many others, mostly connected with the domination of the appetites over the rational element” (*Sophrosyne*, 248–249; trans. North). Of these terms, *Theano to Euboule* mentions the positive ἀρετή, καλός, and αἰδώς, and the negative ἀκόλαστος (line 5), ὕβρις (line 43), τερπνόν (line 27), and φιλήδονος (line 8).

their vices. Her inability to restrain her fears and her laughter, along with her catering to their perceived needs for physical comfort, are signs that she too is a person who is ἀκόλαστος, undisciplined and unbridled, the very opposite of *sōphrosynē*.

That is why Euboule is not a “good mother”: her attention (ἐπιμέλεια) to the children’s true needs has gone awry. So the author warns her twice: (1) “Therefore, watch out, lest you do the work not of a loving mother, but of a flattering one”;⁶⁰ and (2) “Therefore, look out, dear, lest ... by luxury your children may produce evil from insolence and much worthlessness.”⁶¹ The moral-philosophical standards for children must be introduced and inculcated by a wise mother; their training⁶² in *sōphrosynē* is in her hands. The fruits of her mothering labors will be manifested in their behavior. Her success at this early stage of their lives lays the foundation for their own later moral-philosophical development as adults in whom “virtue will be perfected.”

The commands found in this letter for how a “good mother” ought to train her children are typical of instruction on parenting given in many moral-philosophical (and other kinds of) texts. It was a common belief in antiquity that parents were to be held responsible for that training. According to Dixon:

It is not difficult to assemble texts to show that ancient authors saw the parental role as vital to the development of a child’s character.⁶³ Statements commonly take the form of deploring modern trends that impose insufficient discipline on the young child or youth or of praising the parents of a famous man for instilling virtue in him from his earliest years.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ βλέπε οὖν μὴ οὐ φιλούσης ἀλλὰ κολακευούσης ἔργον ποιήσης, lines 4–5.

⁶¹ ἐπιμελῶς δὴ, ὦ φίλη, ... ὑπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς οἱ παῖδες ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ἀχρεϊότητος κακίαν γεννήσωσιν, line 32.

⁶² γυμνάζειν, line 11, which is synonymous with what has earlier been called “guidance to the moderate [way of life]” ἡ πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον ἀγωγή, lines 3–4.

⁶³ See *The Roman Family*, 118, n. 97, where she cites Plautus, *Most.* 118–121; the whole of Juvenal, 14; Tacitus, *Dial.* 28; and Horace, *Serm.* 1.6.71–92. Roman social expectations for parenting included the absolute necessity of providing moral training for one’s children, even when they were young (*ibid.*, ch. 4, esp. 116–119). Aristotle’s contentions about attaining virtue by “habituation” summarize the basic understanding of all ancient philosophical pedagogy: “Then it is right to say that a person becomes just from doing just deeds, and a person becomes *sōphrōn* from doing *sōphrōn* deeds; and no one is going to become good from failing to do these things,” εὖ οὖν λέγεται ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ τὰ δίκαια πράττειν ὁ δίκαιος γίνεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τὰ σῶφρονα ὁ σῶφρων· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μὴ πράττειν αὐτὰ οὐδεὶς ἂν οὐδὲ μελλήσῃε γίνεσθαι ἀγαθός, *Eth. Nic.* 1105b.

⁶⁴ Dixon, *The Roman Family*, 118; and n. 98: “Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.37–41 and Tac. *Dial.* 28–29 both look back to an earlier, better age; Nicolaus 15 commends Atia’s attentiveness to her

Theano to Euboule would fit well within Dixon's imagined assembly of texts that deplore "modern trends" in childrearing since this letter lays the entire responsibility for the children's poor moral development on the mother.⁶⁵ If this is accomplished through her supervision of slaves⁶⁶ (who might clothe, bathe, and/or cook for the children), nonetheless, ultimately the mother is in charge and she must remain attentive to the daily routines and physical needs of her children. "Euboule" purportedly spends much time with her children: she sees them eating, playing, interacting with the nurse, with friends, with elders, and she is aware when they are too cold or too hot. The children are said to come to her with complaints and requests; she is pictured, at the least, in a supervisory role and, at the most, as an

young son's morals." And yet, Dixon continues, "such generalizations are common in so many societies as literary or conversational commonplaces that it is difficult to know whether they bear any relation to everyday practice" (*ibid.*, 118).

⁶⁵ The mother is the main parent, there being no mention at all of their father. Apart from a nurse (mentioned in line 19) there are no other child-minders in view. This suggests that the child(ren) presupposed by the author of *Theano to Euboule* were not yet old enough for a pedagogue, or other childcare persons beyond the nurse. My surmise is based on Bradley's findings that "From the time when a *nutrix* or *nutritor* was no longer needed, or when extra help was required, the pedagogue was probably the child's most constant companion and focal point of reference throughout the early years, even as the circle of social contacts expanded to include, besides parents and relatives, teachers and fellow pupils" (*Discovering the Roman Family*, 55). Bradley seems disapproving of the desire of the Roman elite to hand off their children to other care-givers, saying that mothers "perhaps especially ... did not consider mundane aspects of child tending consistent with or appropriate to their social dignity" (*ibid.*, 56). On the other hand, he then cites possible parental death, fathers' absences due to military or political duties, and divorce and remarriage, as reasons for relying on other (non-parental) childcare givers: "It is within this context of childhood spent in uncertain and frequently shifting parental marital circumstances that the role of child minders may best be appreciated [A] relationship between the child and the attendant was often close and enduring over time" (*ibid.*, 60). Bradley also considers evidence from Plutarch about the roles of parents and nurses: "... Plutarch has much to offer on the topic of the childminding nurse, and while this too seems to derive from personal experience, the constant presence of the nurse in the child's life his remarks assume undercuts to some degree the emphasis on direct parental involvement in child rearing that otherwise seems so strong. He regards nurses, most importantly, as a natural presence in children's lives (*Eroticus* 9), and he knows all their habits and techniques ..." ("Images of Childhood: The Evidence of Plutarch," in *Plutarch's "Advice to the Bride and Groom" and "A Consolation to His Wife": English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* [ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999], 188).

⁶⁶ "In many Roman families, young children would be cared for by nurses and babysitters ..., but the parents were closely involved in their later upbringing. Both parents were expected to give children moral training and oversee their formal education ..." (Dixon, *The Roman Family*, 131).

overly-devoted presence in their daily lives.⁶⁷ In this depiction, *Theano to Euboule* communicates important instructional content for women interested in making moral progress: they must fulfill the role of the “good mother,” which is defined as that of a “loving” mother (φιλούσα) rather than a “flattering” one (κολακεύσουσα). This woman’s work (ἔργον) is twofold: to teach *sōphrosynē* to her children, while at the same time exhibiting her own *sōphrosynē* as a moral example for them.⁶⁸ The fruits of her labors—including her own efforts at acquiring virtue—will be evident in the wholly masculine moral behavior of her male children.⁶⁹

Like the other texts attributed to Pythagorean women, *Theano to Euboule* was meant to be understood as a *Pythagorean* composition, here most obviously through the use of the pseudonym “Theano.” In fact, no female philosopher could offer more appropriate teaching on the topic of proper childrearing: famous as Pythagoras’ disciple and wife, Theano is the most

⁶⁷ The sketch of intense and affectionate mother-children relations in this letter is similar to that in Plutarch’s letter *A Consolation to His Wife*: “And since you share the upbringing of these children, all being reared at home by us ourselves, you yourself know that, because you desired a daughter after bearing four sons, and offered me the opportunity to give your name, I know she was loved in a different way. And a certain special eagerness exists in affection for children of that age; enjoying their purity which is unaffected, and unmixed with any anger or complaint. She herself also by nature had wonderful contentedness and gentleness, and her pleasure in returning love and being agreeable at the same time also allow observation of her human kindness. For not only was she bidding the nurse to give and present her breast to the other infants, but also she would invite, so to speak, the objects and playthings which she enjoyed to her own table by human kindness, giving a part of the good things that she had and sharing the best pleasures with those who delighted her;” οἷσα δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τοσούτων μοι τέκνων ἀνατροφῆς κοινωνήσασα, πάντων ἐκτετραμμένων οἴκοι δι’ αὐτῶν ἡμῶν, τοῦτο δέ, ὅτι καὶ σοὶ ποθοῦσθαι θυγάτηρ μετὰ τέσσαρας υἱοὺς ἐγεννήθη κάμοι τὸ σὸν ὄνομα θέσθαι παρέσχετο ἀφορμὴν, οἶδα ἀγαπητὸν διαφερόντως γενόμενον. πρόσσεστι δὲ καὶ δριμύτης ἰδίᾳ τις τῷ πρὸς τὰ τηλικαῦτα φιλοστοργῶ τὸ εὐφραίνειν αὐτῶν καθαρὸν τε ὃν ἀτεχνῶς καὶ πάσης ἀμειγρῆς ὀργῆς καὶ μέμψεως. αὕτη δὲ καὶ φύσει θαυμαστὴν ἔσχετο εὐκολίαν καὶ πραότητα, καὶ τὸ ἀντιφιλοῦν καὶ χαριζόμενον αὐτῆς ἡδονὴν ἅμα καὶ κατανόησιν τοῦ φιλανθρώπου παρεῖχεν. οὐ γὰρ μόνον βρέφεσιν ἄλλοις ἀλλὰ καὶ σκεύεσιν, οἷς ἐτέρπετο, καὶ παιγνίοις ἐκέλευε τὴν τίτθην διδόναι [καὶ προσφέρειν τὸν μαστὸν] καὶ προσεκαλεῖτο καθάπερ πρὸς τράπεζαν ἰδίαν ὑπὸ φιλανθρωπίας, μεταδιδούσα τῶν καλῶν ὧν εἶχε καὶ τὰ ἥδιστα κοινουμένη τοῖς εὐφραίνουσιν αὐτήν, *Mor.* 608C–D (2). A full translation of this text by Donald Russell, and commentary by Sarah B. Pomeroy, are published in *Plutarch’s “Advice to the Bride and Groom.”* See also in that volume, Keith Bradley, “Images of Childhood,” 183–196, and especially his comment that “The most striking image in the *Consolation* to my mind is Plutarch’s recollection of how his daughter played with her toys [which suggests] a keen observational eye for the young child becomes noticeable in Plutarch” (*ibid.*, 185).

⁶⁸ It is also an implicit assumption of *Myia to Phyllis* that the mother will act as a moral example to her children.

⁶⁹ Here again the tension is posed by placing a woman in charge of the moral training of her sons. The possibility of a mother raising “feminized boys” links to the immoral example of Sardanapallos, discussed above.

respected of them all, as shown in the widespread chreiai and texts attributed to her. She is well-known as the good mother of Pythagoras' several children, who were also trained in his philosophical tradition. While there is no reference to Pythagorean concepts of *harmonia*⁷⁰ or *summetria*,⁷¹ and while the letter is not written in the Doricized Greek of *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, the topic of proper childrearing fits with other Neopythagorean texts that deal with household *topoi*.⁷² Meanwhile, the letter's emphasis on *sōphrosynē*, advice on training children toward virtue, and interest in the woman's traditional role as mother obviously aligns it with the other letters and treatises ascribed to women from the Neopythagorean movement, and secures its position as a textual resource useful in the moral education of women.

SUBJECT MATTER: THEANO TO NIKOSTRATE

Within a Greco-Roman cultural context, the first life stage expected to be achieved by an adult woman is that of getting married.⁷³ That the wife's virtuous and *sōphrōn* character is to be demonstrated in marital fidelity has already been found in the paraenetic letter *Melissa to Kleareta*. The idea of faithfulness in marriage is likewise the occasion for *Theano to Nikostrate*, except that here a wife is faced with her husband's sexual liaison with an *hetaira*.⁷⁴ Philosophical opinion looked down on such extramarital sexual activity by a husband, and *Theano to Nikostrate* shares this outlook.⁷⁵ For

⁷⁰ See Chapter One, n. 83.

⁷¹ The term appears in *Myia to Phyllis*, as noted above, and in *Theano to Nikostrate*, as noted below. See Thom's discussion of the "Pseudepigraphic Treatises" ("The Passions," 69).

⁷² See again the treatise of Diotogenes, *On Sanctity*, on childrearing as vineyard cultivation, 178 n. 82. The topic of training the passions in *Theano to Euboule* is treated in other Neopythagorean texts, as examined by Thom: the treatises by Archytas, as well as Metopus, *On Virtue*; and Theages, *On Virtue; Pythagoras to Hieron*; the letters of Apollonius of Tyana; collections of Pythagorean sayings; and the biographical traditions ("The Passions," 67–78).

⁷³ This is the supposed occasion for *Melissa to Kleareta*, and is mentioned in *Theano to Kallisto* as well.

⁷⁴ This letter never hints that Nikostrate herself is thinking of betraying her wedding vows, although it does consider the possibility that she might divorce her husband.

⁷⁵ Michel Foucault analyzes texts that speak to the "singularity" and "monopoly" of the marital relationship during Roman times, including, among others, Musonius Rufus, *Is Marriage a Handicap for the Pursuit of Philosophy?*; Hierocles, *On Marriage*; Plutarch, *Advice (The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3 [trans. Robert Hurley; New York: Vintage Books (Random House): 1986], esp. Part Five: "The Wife," 145–185). Foucault finds that "... the art of matrimonial existence, while continuing to be concerned with the household, its man-*

example, while Plutarch recognizes that a husband might be involved with other women on occasion, he clearly does not approve:

Therefore, if a private citizen, uncontrolled and unmanageable regarding pleasures, should do something wrong with an *hetaira* or a female slave, it is necessary that his wife not become irritated or angry, considering that it is because he respects her that he shares his drunken behavior and licentiousness with another woman.⁷⁶

Similar counsel is given to a wife in Periktione's treatise *On the Harmony*: "For it is necessary to endure all her husband's actions, even if he is unfortunate, even if he sins on account of ignorance or illness or strong drink, or has sexual intercourse with some other women."⁷⁷ In these sources, it is admitted that such a husband "does wrong," or "sins" in some way, but both then focus on the right-minded response the offended wife is supposed to produce.

Theano to Nikostrate offers more detail as to how the wife ought to comport herself. The first paragraph lays out both the problem (that is, the occasion this letter was ostensibly written to address) and the solution. The "problem" and "solution" may be read as forming Theano's thesis: (1) the main problem is Nikostrate's improper reaction to her husband's affair with the *hetaira*;⁷⁸ (2) however, since such situations will occur, due to the nature

agement, the birth and procreation of children, places an increasing value on a particular element in the midst of this ensemble: the personal relationship between husband and wife, the tie that joins them, their behavior toward each other. And this relationship ... seems to be regarded as a primary and fundamental element around which all the others are organized, from which they derive, and to which they own their strength" (ibid., 148). Foucault has many further references to ancient discussions of a marital fidelity, but he does not cite any of the texts ascribed to Pythagorean women (ibid., 165–175). Deming connects such philosophical debates about marriage with Paul's teachings about marriage, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*).

⁷⁶ ἀν οὖν ιδιώτης ἀνὴρ, ἀκρατὴς δὲ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ ἀνάγωγος, ἐξαμάρτη τι πρὸς ἐταίραν ἢ θεραπαινίδα, δεῖ τὴν γαμετὴν μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν μηδὲ χαλεπαίνειν, λογιζομένην ὅτι παροιρίας καὶ ἀκολασίας καὶ ὕβρεως αἰδούμενος αὐτὴν ἑτέραν μεταδίδωσιν, *Advice, Mor.* 140B (16). Later Plutarch even expresses some sympathy for the wives of such husbands: "So then [wives] suffer these things [i.e., becoming angry and distraught] not when their husbands are perfumed, but when they associate with *hetairai*. It is unjust for the sake of a small pleasure to grieve and to disturb their wives so greatly ..." ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ταῦτα πάσχουσιν οὐ μυριζομένων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀλλὰ συγγιγνομένων ἑτέραις, ἀδικόν ἐστιν ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα μικρᾶς ἐπὶ τοσούτῳ λυπεῖν καὶ συνταράττειν τὰς γυναῖκας, *Advice, Mor.* 144C–D (44).

⁷⁷ φέρειν δὲ χρὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ πάντα, κῆν ἀτυχίῃ, κῆν ἀμάρτη κατ' ἄγνοιαν ἢ νοῦσον ἢ μέθην, ἢ ἀλλησι γυναιξὶ συγγένηται, Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W-H 692.1–3). "Illness" (νοῦσος) is the same condition ascribed to Nikostrate's husband. Note that *On the Harmony* has an expanded list of a husband's negative characteristics that ought to be borne patiently by a wife including anger, stinginess, verbal abuse, etc.

⁷⁸ A secondary problem is the husband's behavior, which Theano agrees is harmful and

of men and the seductive schemes of *hetairai*, the solution is for Nikostrate to “get a grip on herself” before she does irreparable harm to herself, her husband, her family, her household, and to her overall *advantage* (συνφέρον). Thus, the sender repeatedly instructs the recipient about the virtuous wifely response to the situation: the wise woman will look beyond his passion and her jealousy toward her true advantage, which is the marital partnership.

While *Theano to Nikostrate* does not explicitly address the necessity of a wife’s sexual faithfulness, it does securely fix the woman within her marriage⁷⁹ and places on her the responsibility for improving the relationship by waiting out her husband’s dalliance with the *hetaira*. The healthy or diseased condition of the primary household bond between wife and husband has ramifications for the rest of the household, as is shown in the rhetorical question: “But will you have no care for your household and will you destroy your husband?” The welfare of the whole household, the author direly warns, is dependent on the wife not “destroying” her husband.⁸⁰ Thus, as wife, the woman is secondary to her husband; nonetheless, she stands in a powerful position to undermine and harm him, his family, and his property (animate and inanimate). In *Theano to Nikostrate*, the proper fulfillment of the wifely role becomes an ethical imperative for women; thus the letter exemplifies the kind of moral philosophy women need to learn and to embody.

One component of the subject matter stands out: the author’s depiction of marriage as a “partnership” (κοινωνία, line 17),⁸¹ which “Nikostrate” needs

offensive, but is also subject to explanation. In any case, the letter is not addressed to him! A tertiary, though even more tangential, problem is the actions of the *hetaira*, lines 4–5, 9–10, 18–20, 57–59. In this letter, there is no constructive advice for such a woman.

⁷⁹ That the Greek word γυνή means either “woman” or “wife” demonstrates linguistically its overlapping connotations: a woman *is* a wife, or at least, she *ought* to be one.

⁸⁰ Similarly, the wife’s main duties flow from her marital relationship toward the rest of the household: to “carry on in orderly behavior towards [her] husband, and in attentiveness toward [her] household, and in [her] dealings concerning necessities, and in tender love concerning [her] children,” lines 30–33.

⁸¹ Marriage as a *koinōnia* is the cornerstone of Aristotle’s conceptions of social units, as found, for example, in the *Politics*, beginning with the first section. Musonius Rufus’ *Fr.* 13A.1 answers the question: “What is the chief end of marriage?” with: “The chief end of marriage is partnership of life and reproduction of children,” Βίου καὶ γενέσεως παίδων κοινωνίαν κεφάλαιον εἶναι γάμου. Other references to marital partnership in Musonius are found in *Fr.* 13A.18; *Fr.* 13B.4; *Fr.* 14.16, 28, and 44. Likewise, Plutarch perceives of marriage as a κοινωνία, based on the spouses’ sympathy for each other, their sexual activity that results in children, and on the sharing of their material property (*Advice, Mor.* 140D–E [20]). The word κοινωνία to describe marriage is found, e.g., in Hierocles, *On Marriage* 55; and Antipater of Tarsus, *On Marriage* (lines 25–26, Deming’s edition), but it does not appear in the Pastoral Letters.

to understand as synonymous with “love for her husband.”⁸² In fact, the two spouses are so connected in such a relationship that what hurts one automatically hurts the other and spreads to the whole household. This is because marriage is entered into for one’s “advantage” (τὸ συμφέρον, line 10), which is posited as the exact opposite of “harm” to both spouses: it is not only her husband harming his own life, but the actions of Nikostrate too are viewed as damaging her own advantage (καταβλάπτειν, lines 50–51; cf. also βλάβη, lines 26, 57). The author makes a positive emotional and sexually-suggestive appeal through the image of a loving reconciliation between husband and wife: “... the differences among lovers bring about more intimate reconciliations.”⁸³

The Pythagorean character of this letter inheres first in the authorial pseudonym of “Theano,” the best and wisest of female philosophers. She herself is famous as a modest and faithful wife to Pythagoras; thus she may serve well as a teacher and example to other married women.⁸⁴ Additionally, in addressing a woman’s principal relationship with her husband, the letter fits nicely into the literary context of other Neopythagorean writings on the household. By exhorting the recipient to replace her negative emotions with more positive ones, the author demonstrates an awareness that this topic too is a common one within the field of moral philosophical texts. But as with the other four letters attributed to Pythagorean women, the twist represented by *Theano to Nikostrate* remains in the application of these moral-philosophical *topoi* to women in particular. The resulting text is distinguished by the gender differentiated nature of its instruction, which became part of the curriculum for the moral training of women.

⁸² τὴν φιλίαν ἡγή (lac. indicavi) τοῦ ἀνδρός, line 16. Earlier, marriage has been described as “companionship” (lines 8–9), which functions as a synonym of κοινωνία.

⁸³ Cf. also the promise that “... he will wish to be reconciled quickly, and he will love you more affectionately,” τάχιον διαλλαγῆναι θελήσει, προσπαθέστερον δὲ φιλοστοργήσει, lines 40–42.

⁸⁴ Indeed, Theano did not “remain alone apart from a man, that is to say, very unmarried,” even after the death of Pythagoras. According to Iamblichus, she was then married to Aristaios, Pythagoras’ successor, *VP* 265. There is no evidence that Pythagoras or Aristaios strayed from marital intimacy with Theano. According to Hermesianax, Pythagoras himself was smitten with Theano from the first, and all subsequent references depict a close-knit family life populated by legitimate children; cf. Chapter Two.

SUBJECT MATTER: THEANO TO KALLISTO

In the Greco-Roman world, a third role to be taken on by an adult woman, alongside those of “wife” and “mother,” is that of *despoina*, which indicates yet again that the household is perceived as the approved domain for women’s activities. As has already been seen in the letter *Melissa to Kleareta*, which opens the Composite A letter-collection, appropriate wifely adornment and virtue are linked with good household management: “for the woman who strives for *sōphrosynē* must not be enthusiastic for the extravagance of clothing, but for the management of her household [ἐξ τὰν οἰκονομίας τῷ οἴκῳ].”⁸⁵ *Theano to Kallisto* concentrates on what this *oikonomia* (line 4) meant for a woman married to a male head-of-household: “... the first rule over the household for women is rule over the female slaves.”⁸⁶ The letter explains that with respect to the supervision of household slaves “a

⁸⁵ Lines 18–19. The repetition of *οἰκο-* in the last phrase makes clear that the author is discussing the domestic arena only, and *not* the “management” of any other social group. The connotations of *oikonomia* in this clause reflect the breadth of the term’s meaning as found in the NT; for those instances BDAG offers three main definitions: (1) “responsibility of management” (the *οἰκονομία* of a paid “steward” [οἰκονόμος] of an estate in Lk 16:2–4, and of Paul’s “commission” in 1Cor 9:17, and his “stewardship” in Eph 3:2); (2) the “state of being arranged” (of God’s “plan of the fullness of time” in Eph 1:10 and “the plan of the mystery” in 3:9); and (3) “program of instruction, training” (as in 1Tim 1:4), BDAG, s.v. *οἰκονομία*.

⁸⁶ ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐστὶν οἴκου πρώτη γυναιξὶν ἀρχὴ θεραπαινῶν, lines 7–8. *Theano to Kallisto* highlights the *despoina*’s supervision of female slaves, θεραπαινῶν in particular, but a *despoina* could own and thus have legal power over male slaves as well. Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald analyze the “gendering” of female slaves (*A Woman’s Place*, ch. 5, “Female Slaves: Twice Vulnerable”). They state: “Gender, what it is to be man or woman, masculine or feminine, as distinct from male or female, differs cross-culturally. In most slave systems, while slaves undeniably have a sex, they do not have gender. Thus a male slave is not a man (*anēr, vir*) and therefore cannot have masculine traits assigned to him Consequently, a female slave is not a woman (*gynē, mulier*) and thus cannot have feminine traits ascribed to her, nor the social expectations of a woman in her culture, nor can she claim any status privileges inherent in the cultural construct of womanhood” (ibid., 96). In these Pythagorean letters, two items work against Osiek and MacDonald’s concept. First, in *Myia to Phyllis* we read above the exhortation for wet-nurses, who were of a lower status, possibly even slaves, to exhibit certain feminine virtues, especially that they are to be *sōphrōn*. Second, *Theano to Kallisto* does ascribe “humanity” to the female slaves, as noted above (lines 13–14). See also the important essays in *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations* (eds. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan; London: Routledge, 1998). The introduction by the editors claims: “... ancient Greek and Roman societies always combined slaveholding and patriarchy, and this combination promoted a constant process of comparison and differentiation. Women and slaves were similarly distinguished from free men by their social subordination and their imagined otherness” (ibid., 3).

young soul must be brought up in these things from girlhood,”⁸⁷ although, as we have seen, under the characteristics of paraenesis it is not necessary to interpret this statement as implying something deficient about Kallisto’s upbringing. The young wife in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* betrays a similar lack of experience in this arena. It seems her mother has laid the groundwork in teaching her “to be moderate” (εἶναι σωφρονεῖν), but it remains for her husband Ischomachus to teach her more particulars about household management,⁸⁸ especially how to handle the (indoor) slaves.⁸⁹ The thesis statement is that “goodwill” on the part of the slaves toward the *despoina* is “of greatest importance in slave relations; for this acquisition is not purchased along with their bodies, but astute owners engender it later.”⁹⁰ However, the author also encourages reciprocity in goodwill extending from the *despoina* towards her slaves, especially in her just distribution of food and even-handedness in discipline.

In *Theano to Kallisto*, the supervision of labor within the household is expressed by means of terms that refer to “command” and “authority”; for example: “authority has indeed been given by custom to have command over the household slaves.”⁹¹ The woman’s title is variable: either κύρια (line 26), or δέσποινα (line 37), or even the “generic” masculine οἱ συνετοὶ δεσπότεαι (line 11); her judgment is called δεσποτική (line 30). Even though *sōphrosynē* is not explicitly referred to in this letter, the contrast between the self-control of a good *despoina* and the lack of self-control in an abusive *despoina* forms a powerful antithesis that is useful for instructing women newly-arrived at household management.

According to *Theano to Kallisto*, while this household ruler must remember that her slaves “are human beings by nature” (lines 13–14), nonetheless,

⁸⁷ ἐν τούτοις γὰρ παρθενοτροφείσθαι δεῖ νέαν ψυχὴν, line 7.

⁸⁸ Beginning in *Oec.* 7.10, Ischomachus begins to describe to his young wife how their partnership is going to work out on a practical level. She responds, “What might I be able to join in doing with you? What is my ability? But everything is in your power. My mother told me my work is to be *sōphrōn*,” Τί δ’ ἂν ἐγὼ σοι, ἔφη, δυναίμην συμπράξαι; τίς δέ ἡ ἐμὴ δύναμις; ἀλλ’ ἐν σοὶ πάντα ἐστίν· ἐμὸν δ’ ἔφησεν ἡ μήτηρ ἔργον εἶναι σωφρονεῖν. He says he was taught the same by his father, but that now *sōphrosynē* will manifest itself in the betterment and increase of their property. Antipater of Tarsus complains of young men who are “not teaching [their wives] concerning household management,” μὴ διδάσκειν περὶ οἰκονομίας, *On Marriage* (line 47, Deming’s edition).

⁸⁹ See again Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.10–43, where the mistress of a house is portrayed as a queen bee (μέλισσα), who keeps the other bees working in an organized fashion; see also my discussion above of bees and household management on the pseudonym “Melissa.”

⁹⁰ ἔστι δέ, ὦ φίλη, μέγιστον ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ εὖνοια· αὕτη γὰρ οὐ συναγοράζεται τοῖς σώμασιν ἡ κτήσις, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὑστέρου γεννώσιν αὐτὴν οἱ συνετοὶ δεσπότεαι, lines 8–11.

⁹¹ ἡ μὲν ἐξουσία παρὰ τοῦ νόμου δέδοται τῶν οἰκετῶν ἄρχειν, lines 2–3.

the *despoina* has complete control over her female slaves' bodies and activities. She is to exercise her authority over the female slaves in two general areas: the "regimen" of household tasks (lines 12–19) and dealing with "disorderly conduct" (lines 20–39). This letter does not give much specificity about either the routine tasks accomplished in the household or the actual provisions supplied to laboring slaves. Instead, it offers the cardinal virtue of "justice" as the principle for determining the daily nutrition required for a slave to do her assigned work:

Just employment is the cause of this: so that they might neither be distressed on account of their labor nor be incapacitated on account of their need, for they are human beings by nature But as for you, let there be a ready measure of grain corresponding to the amount of wool-working for each day's tasks.⁹²

The term "wool-working" (τῆς ἐριουργίας, line 19) is a sort of *synecdoche*, standing for everything that might be considered "women's work" in household. In fact, "wool-working" already has more than one activity associated with it, e.g., acquiring, washing, bleaching, combing, carding, spinning, weaving, and dyeing the wool, and then sewing it into clothes.⁹³

⁹² δικαία δὲ χρήσις αἰτία τούτου, ἵνα μήτε διὰ τὸν κόπον κάμνωσι, μήτε ἀδυνατώσι διὰ τὴν ἔνδειαν· εἰσὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι τῇ φύσει σοὶ δὲ πρόχειρον ἔστω τὸ μέτρημα τῶν σιτίων πρὸς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῆς ἐριουργίας τοῖς ἐφ' ἡμέραν πόνοις, lines 12–14, 18–19. This χρήσις is reminiscent of Aristotle's statement about "acquiring" and "using" slaves: "The master's science is that of understanding the employment of slaves. For the master [is] not concerned with acquiring the slaves, but in employing slaves. This science has nothing great or dignified, for whatever the slave must know how to do, the former [i.e., the master] must know how to organize these things," *δεσποτική δ' ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶν ἡ χρηστική δούλων. ὁ γὰρ δεσπότης οὐκ ἐν τῷ κατὰσθαι τοὺς δούλους, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ χρῆσθαι δούλοις. ἔστι δ' αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστήμη οὐδὲν μέγα ἔχουσα οὐδὲ σεμνόν· ἂ γὰρ τὸν δούλον ἐπίστασθαι δεῖ ποιεῖν, ἐκείνον δὲ ταῦτα ἐπίστασθαι ἐπιτάττειν*, *Pol.* 1255b.31–35. However, Aristotle would not necessarily agree that slaves are "human beings by nature," since he views those who are slaves as "naturally" slaves: "... for the one who is able to foresee with his mind is by nature a ruler, while the one who is able to do these things with his body is ruled over and by nature a slave," τὸ μὲν γὰρ δυνάμενον τῇ διανοίᾳ προορᾶν ἄρχον φύσει καὶ δεσπόζον φύσει, τὸ δὲ δυνάμενον [ταῦτα] τῷ σώματι πονεῖν ἀρχόμενον καὶ φύσει δούλον, *Pol.* 1252a.32–34. Specific instructions for how much to feed slaves on a large estate can be found in Cato's *De Ag.* 56–58, with monthly allotments of wheat, bread, wine, olives, fish-pickle, vinegar, oil, and salt, along with a yearly clothing allowance of one tunic, a blanket, and wooden shoes.

⁹³ Cf. Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.6, 21, 34, 36, 41 (the last on teaching a slave to spin). For inscriptional and artistic evidence on wool-working as a feminine virtue, see Lena Larsson Lovén, "Lanam fecit: woolworking and female virtue," in *Aspects of Women in Antiquity* (Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity; eds. Lena Larsson Lovén and Agneta Strömberg [Jonsered: P. Åströms Förlag, 1998]), 85–95. North also points out: "On both Greek and Roman monuments there is a tendency to link the basic feminine virtue with

On the other hand, an opposite result is obtained when *despoinai* work their slaves without regard for their nutritional needs:

Some women consider as profit what is most unprofitable, namely, the maltreatment of their female slaves: oppressing them with tasks, while in turn, reducing their provisions. Then, saving for themselves petty profits, they suffer great losses: the worst disaffections and plots.⁹⁴

The contrast of financial gain and loss stresses that the author was describing life in a slave-based society which recognized the literal economic value of slaves and their production. If one has invested in the purchase of slaves, one ought to protect that investment at least to the point of keeping the labor force in good health.⁹⁵

The second responsibility for a *despoina*, that of slave “discipline,” seems to be somewhat more complicated for the author to advise upon: there is a balancing act to perform between punishment that is too harsh or too lenient. In fact, the author again invokes the virtue of “justice” in the statement: “Let judgment have the first place in this matter with you, by which you will, on the one hand, distinguish the truth of the sin in relation to what is just condemnation, and on the other, distinguish the extent of the

wool-working. Every student of Roman epigraphy remembers the formula *domum servavit, lanam fecit* (she kept house, she spun wool) which concludes the epitaph for a Claudia of the Gracchan age (CE 52) (“The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee,” 41). Other evidence that perceives wool-working as a feminine virtue is given by Kristina Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus* (Oxford Studies in Classical Literature and Gender Theory; eds. David Konstan and Alison Sharrock; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 29–31. Milnor analyzes the depictions of the women in Augustus’ family taking on domestic tasks; for example, “Unless he had a good reason, [Augustus] never wore anything other than his indoor clothes, which had been made by his sister or wife or daughter and granddaughters ...” (ibid., 84; translation of Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 73, by Milnor). Augustus put such “facts” to work so that “... the actions of the imperial women as part of the household are here made part of the characterization of Augustus: their correct performance of traditional domestic values reads as part of the princeps’ own commitment to a virtuous Roman home” (ibid., 85).

⁹⁴ ἔνιαι δὲ τὸ κέρδος ἀκερδέστατον ἡγούνται, τὴν τῶν θεραπεινῶν κακουχίαν, βαρύνουσαι μὲν τοῖς ἔργοις, ὑποστελλόμεναι δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων· εἴτα ὀβολιαῖα κέρδη περιποιούμεναι μεγάλοις ζημιούνται τιμήμασι, δυσνοαῖσι καὶ ἐπιβουλαῖς κακίσταις, lines 14–18. Also, the author states a little further on: “For you must value female slaves according to their worth,” τιμᾶν μὲν γὰρ δεῖ θεραπαίνας τὸ κατ’ ἀξίαν, lines 21–22. A similar good financial result would be attained by following Ischomachus’ advice to his wife in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*: if she would teach an unskilled slave how to spin, she would “also double her [i.e., the slave’s] value to you,” ποιήσης καὶ διπλασίου σοι ἀξία, *Oec.* 7.41.

⁹⁵ Ischomachus tells his wife that one of her responsibilities will be to nurse any sick slaves. She responds that this will be “most pleasing,” ἐπιχαριτώτατον, Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.37–38.

sins committed in relation to what is worthy of punishment.”⁹⁶ If there is an instance where “punishment” fails, a slave must be sold.⁹⁷

But what about the perfectly legal action of whipping one’s slaves?⁹⁸ This author does not approve of such *despoinai*: “For some women, dear, from cruelty, even whip the bodies of their female slaves, becoming brutal because of jealousy or anger, just as if they were inscribing a record of the excess of their bitterness.”⁹⁹ The lashing is wrong for two reasons: it arises from the mistresses’ negative emotions (“cruelty,” “jealousy,” “anger,” “excess of bitterness”), which become permanently visible in the scars on the slave-bodies, and it has an absolutely destructive effect on the slave-women who are whipped (they either run away or commit suicide).¹⁰⁰ As with the advice to guard one’s financial investment in slaves, Theano appeals again to the *despoina*’s self-interest: she warns that a violent *despoina* will find herself totally alone (i.e., without any slave labor) and regretting her ill-advised approach to household affairs. Her “thoughtlessness” (ἀβουλία) resonates and contrasts impressively with “the most suitable counsel” (τὴν συμβουλήν οἰκειοτάτην, line 6) that comes from the older women, which forms the paraenesis of this letter. If only the lamenting *despoina* had listened to the older women, she could have avoided this miserable state.

⁹⁶ ἔστω δέ σοι γνώμη τοῦδε πρόεδρος, καθ’ ἣν γνώση τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς τῆς ἀμαρτίας πρὸς τὸ τῆς καταγνώσεως δίκαιον, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων μέγεθος πρὸς τὸ κατ’ ἀξίαν τῆς κολάσεως, lines 26–29. This *κόλασις* is the opposite of the *ἀκολασία* that Nikostrate is warned against: “For fights and reproaches do not stop intemperance,” *Theano to Nikostrate*, line 61.

⁹⁷ “But if the excess of their wickedness cannot be conquered, then one must banish them for sale,” εἴαν δὲ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς κακίας ἀνίκητος ᾗ, ἐξοριστέον μετὰ πράσεως, lines 24–25.

⁹⁸ Saller notes that “One of the primary distinctions between the condition of a free man and a slave in the Roman mind was the vulnerability of the latter to corporal punishment, in particular lashings at another man’s private whim” (*Patriarchy, Property and Death*, 137). Saller argues further that susceptibility to corporal punishment was also a distinction between slaves and children: “The master’s authority had to be coercive (to ‘break’ the slave), because the master-slave relationship was inherently exploitative. The servile spirit was one motivated by grudging fear, goaded by the lash This was not the mentality that Roman writers wished to instill in their children The aim was to imbue the child with a sense of both his honorable position and the shame that would contribute to self-restraint” (ibid., 151).

⁹⁹ An example of such a woman who beats her slaves is cited by Saller: “Juvenal portrays a slighted wife as a much more vicious character who has her slaves savagely whipped as she transfers the target of her anger from her husband to her helpless servants (6.481)” (ibid., 148). Also, “Seneca criticizes the short temper of a master who has slaves whipped for talking during dinner or for giving the master an insolent look (*Ira* 3.24–25)” (ibid., 149).

¹⁰⁰ “For in time, some slaves, being worn out, have been destroyed, and others procured their deliverance by escape, and others stopped living, set free by death at their own hand,” αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀνηλώθησαν χρόνῳ διαπονόμεναι, αἱ δὲ φυγῇ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐπορίσαντο, τινὲς δὲ ἐπαύσαντο τοῦ ζῆν αὐτόχειρι θανάτῳ μεταστᾶσαι, lines 35–37.

Ultimately, the very real balancing act for a house-mistress is summed up in the final command that relies upon a maxim: “And you must think about this: proportion [μέτρον] is best in all things.” If the recipient does indeed “think about this,” she will recall the appeals for measured supervision already given in the letter: “just employment” that does not make the slave-women’s work too burdensome and provides appropriate nourishment; discipline that is based on reasoning, not anger; punishment that “fits the crime”; the rejection of extreme physical brutality; and the moral example of correctly-tuned musical instruments. At each step in her daily slave-supervision, the *despoina* has the opportunity to demonstrate her own virtue and, for this letter, one would have to say that in this arena the most important virtue at work is justice, δικαιοσύνη. The *just despoina* is a woman who measures work and food fairly, who dispenses right discipline for infractions, who correctly adjudges the mutual disasters that would arise from abusing her slaves, and chooses instead to benefit herself and them by treating them as human beings. She embodies the feminine kind of *dikaio-syne* envisioned in Phintys’ treatise *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman*, and in *Fragment 3* of Musonius Rufus: a female version (*despoina*) of a male δεσπότης; a *despoina* who supervises *female* slaves (θεραπαίνειν); a *despoina* who is responsible for household things (female slaves, wool-working, and provisions); thus a *despoina* who enacts justice in the domestic realm, not in any political arena. While the *despoina* is consistently depicted in Greco-Roman literature as subordinate to the male head-of-household, with regard to these female slaves and women’s day-to-day work she has authority (ἐξουσία) to rule (ἄρχειν) in that household.¹⁰¹

The subject matter of *Theano to Kallisto*, the last letter in the collection *TH3*, completes Theano’s teachings on the foundational triad of women’s household roles: wife, mother, and *despoina*, which function as precise correlates to the typical male responsibilities as husband, father, and *despotēs*. This gender-differentiation arises from the belief that the moral excellence of a woman is shown when she exhibits the virtues of *sōphrosynē* and *dikaio-syne* within her own domestic household and not in some more public (and masculine) realm.¹⁰² Allegedly from a known Pythagorean, *Theano*

¹⁰¹ *Theano to Kallisto*, lines 2–3.

¹⁰² Taking into account Roman law, architecture, and benefactions, classical scholars recently have opened an important debate “about how, why, and where we should use the words ‘public’ and ‘private’ to describe the ancient world” (Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity*, 17). Part of the problem is with the semantic ranges of “private” and “public” in modern English (ibid., 18–27). Another issue is the ideological exploitation of “domesticity” as an Augustan

to *Kallisto* is comparable to several Neopythagorean texts that treat the topic of *oikonomia*, but these others consistently appear under a man's name and give instructions from the perspective of husband, father, and master-of-the-house.¹⁰³ The elements that set this letter apart are its female sender and recipient, along with its focus on the distinctly feminine duty of supervising female household slaves. Even though we have no specific attestation of Theano as a *despoina*, the reader may presume that such a *sōphrōn* woman philosopher from a noble¹⁰⁴ and educated family would have much wisdom to impart on the subject of household management for women in particular.

To reiterate, the five-letter collection addresses the domestic roles specific to women: wife, mother, and mistress of the house. Even the sub-collection of the three letters attributed to Theano taken by themselves treat these roles as well, offering further evidence that the “feminine” triad is as deeply-rooted as the threefold masculine positions of husband, father, and master in the Roman worldview. When the epistolary contents are read as a collected whole, they present a detailed model for feminine virtue, as illustrated next in the Conclusion to Part One.

political strategy (ibid., 27–46, and throughout). Milnor states: “If one of the tasks of the new imperial government was to find a way for Rome, in the aftermath of civil war, to imagine herself once again as a community of shared values, *the domestic sphere offered an uncontroversial place to focus public attention ...*” (ibid., 27; my italics). Overlaying the entire problem is the fact that good domestic life is “gendered,” in that women in particular are responsible for the activities and reputation of the household.

¹⁰³ As I observed in the Introduction, the only male Pythagorean philosopher who gives instructions directly to women is Pythagoras himself. His “speech to the women of Kroton” advises about the best way for a woman to make prayers and sacrifices, about her relationship to her husband, and about women sharing with one another, among other topics. The women respond positively to Pythagoras’ speech: “It has been handed down that on account of his praises of piety such a great change was made toward economical clothing, so that not one of the women dared to put on expensive clothes, but they dedicated all these many thousands of clothes in the temple of Hera,” διὰ δὲ τῶν εἰς τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐπαίνων πρὸς τὴν εὐτέλειαν τὴν κατὰ τὸν ἱματισμὸν τηλικαύτην παραδέδοται κατασκευάσαι τὴν μεταβολήν, ὥστε τὰ πολυτελῆ τῶν ἱματίων μηδεμίαν ἐνδύεσθαι τολμᾶν, ἀλλὰ θείναι πάσας εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἥρας ἱερὸν πολλὰς μυριάδας ἱματίων, Iambl., *VP* 54.

¹⁰⁴ For example, Iamblichus knows legends of the “high birth” of Pythagoras of Samos; see *VP* 2–10, for stories of Pythagoras’ early life; see also the notes on these sections in Clark, *Iamblichus*, 2–4.

CONCLUSION TO PART ONE

THE GOOD WOMAN *TOPOS*

My analysis of these five letters attributed to Pythagorean women has been based on the idea that they represent an educational program, by which I mean that when they are studied as a corpus the letters are designed to function as a full and appropriate curriculum for women who want to receive training in what is called Greco-Roman moral philosophy, as mapped out through the life-roles of women. Based on this idea, I have organized my investigation of the texts around four general pedagogical components: the production and reading of textual resources, the characterization of teachers and learners; the instructional methods used; and the subject matter to be covered.

Two of the components—the use of epistolary text in collections and the rhetorical methods adapted for instructional purposes—show no specifically gendered qualities in their approach to the training of women. The production of real and pseudonymous letter-collections is a common enough practice chosen by men who sought to teach philosophy to male (and sometime female) students. Similarly, the dissuasive and persuasive methods presented in these letters, adapted from the oral context of rhetorical and philosophical schools, are also utilized by male authors. As with letters of paraenesis and censure from men, the Pythagorean women's letters replicate the teacher-student relationship in an epistolary form, placing a monologue in the mouth of the superior author and teacher, while the subordinate recipient-learner remains almost necessarily silent. That these components are common to letters from both men and women discloses the inherent but unarticulated assumption that both sexes have the mental capacity to understand and respond to such an approach to moral education. The real authors of the Pythagorean letters believe that women as well as men are able to hear and comprehend texts. Women as well as men are predisposed to react properly to antithetical reasoning, to warnings and promises, to moral and immoral examples. While the sexes may be "opposite" in some other ways, the authors of these letters affirm that women have some attributes in common with men, and thus they possess the ability to make progress in virtue.

Of course, it is one of the persistent attractions of the five letters that they also display some "feminine" qualities; these appear in the components

of female teachers and learners, and subject matter. The letters postulate up front a special instructional relationship, with older women as authors and teachers and younger women as recipients and learners. The famous figures from a Pythagorean past, Theano, Myia, and Melissa, are perfectly positioned to function as virtuous philosophical teachers of younger women who aspire to moral excellence.¹ From what was known about them through chreiai and attestations, these three are particularly worthy examples for imitation by other women. Here the familiar ancient pedagogical technique of imitating reputable persons and/or one's teacher takes a distinctively female twist. There are no male figures offered to be imitated; in fact, the only famous man mentioned is the licentious, and thoroughly *effeminate*, Sardanapallos. Thus, in these literary constructions of women-teaching-women, the presumption of sex differentiation remains in force and is, in fact, *reinforced* by the letters themselves.

"THE GOOD WOMAN" *TOPOS*

Perhaps the most commonly remarked upon characteristic of the Pythagorean women's letters is the "feminine" quality of their subject matter. Within the classical rhetorical context, the persistent theme of this epistolary collection has become a philosophical *topos* (τόπος). As defined by Johan C. Thom, "A *topos* may be distinguished from another topic by its traditional subject matter, evidenced by the fact that it *recurs in the writings of different authors*, and by the conventional treatment it receives."² Thom has placed the issue of "women" in a group of *topoi* related to the family, including "marriage, sexual love, the household, parents and children, *the role of women*."³

¹ It is also important to remember that the three names provide a strong impetus for the initial production of the letters, and their subsequent gathering into collections. Furthermore, the authorial pseudonyms serve to add authority to, while at the same time borrowing authority from, the other letters in the collections.

² "The Mind is its Own Place': Defining the *Topos*," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture, Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (NovTSup 110; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 567; my italics.

³ Thom contributes this longer list of *topoi*: "If we, for example, just glance at the titles of works representing different philosophical schools ... we find that the following topics are treated over and over again: (a) marriage, sexual love, the household, parents and children, the role of women (b) friendship, frank speech, flattery (c) education and training (d) statesmanship (e) anger and other passions (f) pleasure and pain (g) tranquility and equanimity (h) progress in virtue (i) vices (j) personal adornment (k) justice (l) different ways of life (m) wealth and poverty (n) providence, fate, suffering (o) piety and the gods" (ibid., 567–568).

Through my analyses of the Pythagorean women's letters, I have more fully described the last *topos* in Thom's set and applied to it a new label: "the good woman." Ancient texts that treat this *topos* do not simply explain "the role of women"; instead they stress and advocate for the qualities and activities believed necessary to demonstrations of female virtue. Thom's framework for grouping the related *topoi* reflects my findings that the socially approved arena for any "good woman" to enact her virtue is precisely within her household. My findings also draw on Thom's concept of a *topos* as a sort of mental landscape:

The moral universe in the Graeco-Roman world is thus divided into regions or *topoi*, each with its own internal structure, based on the questions it is meant to answer. *Topoi* are also connected to one another in terms of a variety of semantic relationships The topical landscape forms an intricate network of relationships [among *topoi*].⁴

Extrapolating from Thom's description, I envision the treatments of "the good woman" as illustrating a "feminine moral topography," a map of the contours of the virtue, moral development, and social responsibilities specific to women. Furthermore, Thom argues that "Once the moral world has been mapped out in terms of *topoi*, an author can use these *topoi* as points of reference: he does not have to describe the topic in detail; a few reminders are sufficient."⁵ The subject matter of a *topos* itself, conveyed by even just a title or a few customarily *topical* words or phrases, may act like a mental magnet that attracts other ideas and assumptions relevant to the *topos*. Therefore, the sources that address this *topos* do not need to refer to every aspect of it, but may simply employ several elements in order to stimulate the reader to fill in the rest of the topical map.

One feature of the *topos* of "the good woman" is especially prominent: that is the concept of *sōphrosynē*. As early as 1966, Helen North traced the varied demonstrations and discussions of this virtue through Greek (and some Latin) literature. Yet in a footnote on her first page she shares a conclusion which is foundational for "the good woman" *topos*: "*Feminine* sophrosyne (chastity, modesty, obedience, inconspicuous behavior) remains the same throughout Greek history."⁶ I would observe that although

⁴ Ibid., 569.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ North, *Sophrosyne*, 1, n. 2; my italics. In this volume, North prefers simply to bring the word *sophrosyne* into English without italics or diacriticals. She uses the Latin term *virtus feminarum* in her preface, and then in reference to patristic literature (*Sophrosyne*, viii, and

North claims that women's *sōphrosynē* supposedly "remains the same," she nonetheless has offered four different definitions to delineate its boundaries. About a decade later, North takes up the idea again, stating: "... *sophrosyne* is the most multifaceted of all the Greek virtues, and some of its aspects belong exclusively to men. What is the *sophrosyne* of women?"⁷ Her thesis attaches *sōphrosynē* to both the "chastity" and "domesticity" of "the good woman."⁸ However, she then shifts her focus off the "chastity" aspect of female *sōphrosynē* and onto its "domesticity," in order to consider the strong relationship of both masculine and feminine *sōphrosynē* to household management (*oikonomia*). While North has pointed out some essential aspects of female virtue, these have been raised one by one, and they are not carefully linked to each other in order to represent the ancient map delineated by "the good woman" *topos*. In addition, she has used the English word "chastity" for a woman's sexual self-control, but it seems to me that the meaning of this term has become more ambiguous. The fact that both a virginal female and a sexually faithful wife may be called "chaste" makes this word confusing.⁹ Then too, North does not explain how "chastity" relates to proper household management by women.

In an essay on 1 Timothy 2:9–15, Malherbe cites many ancient literary parallels on feminine expressions of *sōphrosynē*, highlighting the ideas of Cicero, Musonius Rufus,¹⁰ Plutarch, Sophocles, Euripides, Antiphanes, and Crates, among others. Malherbe makes a list of the clear conceptual links between women's *sōphrosynē* and their overall self-control, purity in sexual behavior, moderate adornment, modesty, silence, and orderliness (all

314). She cites Ambrose's characterization of Judith's *temperantia* as the "*virtus feminarum*" in *De Vid.* 7.40 (*Sophrosyne*, 363). In her later article she states that by ca. 355 CE, "... *sophrosyne* had long been accepted as the principal *virtus feminarum* and as such was mentioned in numberless epitaphs, celebrated in rhetorical *topoi* concerned with feminine *arete*, and ascribed to various mythical exemplars ..." ("The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee," 35; note that here North does italicize the word).

⁷ Ibid., 35–36.

⁸ Ibid., 45. In this essay, North does not analyze the Neopythagorean texts that I examine here.

⁹ Deming sees a scholarly confusion between "celibacy" and "asceticism" (*Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, xiv–xv). Similarly, I wonder if "chastity" might be erroneously linked to "asceticism" and "celibacy."

¹⁰ For example, *Fragment 3* of Musonius Rufus states: "But above all a woman must be *sōphrōn* [Lutz: "chaste and self-controlled"]; she must, I mean, be pure in respect of unlawful love, exercise restraint in other pleasures, not be a slave to desire, not be contentious, not lavish in expense, nor extravagant in dress. Such are the works of the *sōphrōn* [Lutz: virtuous] woman ..." (trans. Lutz).

elements of the instructions for women found in the Pastoral Letters).¹¹ In his conclusion, Malherbe moves toward the idea of a *topos* as a mental map by using the image of a mosaic:

The individual details are like the tesserae in a mosaic: they contribute to the whole picture, but their functions in doing so are determined by the design or pattern to which they contribute. The image of a mosaic also captures the static nature of the individual parts, and the fact that they are to be seen in relation to the whole.¹²

But Malherbe does not examine further how these items might be positioned in relation with each other, saying that the evidence he presents is only the first step.¹³

How does *sōphrosynē* figure as a key feature on a mental map of women's morality? Is *sōphrosynē* akin to the peak of a high mountain that she might reach at the end of an arduous climb? Is it like a river delta where waters finally flow into the sea? No, the moral-philosophical writings testify that this central virtue is more like a woman's home-base, functioning as both the beginning *and* the ending of her life-journey. In fact, since her *sōphrosynē* is to be demonstrated primarily within the social context of the household, a woman never travels far—both literally and metaphorically—from this particular place.

In order to clarify and expand the work of North and Malherbe on feminine *sōphrosynē* I turn again to the treatise *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman* ascribed to "Phintys, the Pythagorean daughter of Kallikratos" (Φιντύος τῆς Καλλικράτους θυγατρὸς Πυθαγορείας). Following the lead of the text itself, I show that the first and most essential demonstration of *sōphrosynē* for a woman is to remain sexually faithful to her husband. Furthermore, all other prescribed female displays of the virtue (in adornment, speech and silence, childbearing and childrearing, household management, and activities outside the house) manifest this one primary achievement: a woman's uninterrupted practice of marital fidelity.

In its introduction, *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman* explicitly takes up the moral-philosophical *topos* of "the good woman": "In sum, it is necessary for a *good woman* [ἀγαθὴν] also to be well-behaved [χοσμίαν]; for without virtue

¹¹ Malherbe simply states the *sōphrōn* behaviors for women found in 1Tim 2:9–15: "... order/adornment, quietness/silence, self-respect/modesty, appropriateness of behavior, marital relations and having children" ("The *Virtus Feminarum*," 64).

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 65.

she might never become such.”¹⁴ Abiding by the title of this treatise, which may or may not be original, the author then defines the primary virtue of “the good woman” with this thesis statement:¹⁵ “... and the supreme virtue [μάλιστα ἀρετά] of a woman is *sōphrosynē*; for by this [virtue] she will be able both to honor and to love her own husband.”¹⁶ With this assertion, the author posits an inseparable connection between feminine *sōphrosynē* and the marriage relationship as the governing principle for all other manifestations of womanly virtue. The words of the treatise reaffirm this one fundamental declaration, as the author methodically enumerates¹⁷ the ways in which this virtue is to be literally embodied by a woman:

Therefore, it is necessary for a woman who is being educated to gain knowledge about *sōphrosynē*: from how many and what kinds of things does this good thing come to [maturity in] a woman. So then I say [it comes] from these five: first, from sanctity and piety with respect to the marriage bed; second, from the adornment of her body; third, from the expeditions from her own house; fourth, from not engaging in secret orgiastic rites and great mother celebrations; and fifth, in being discreet and moderate in the sacrifice to the

¹⁴ Τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀγαθὸν δεῖ ἡμεῖς καὶ κοσμίαν· ἄνευ γὰρ ἀρετᾶς οὐδέποκα γένοιτό τις τοιαῦτα, Stob., *Anth.* 61 (W.-H. 588, 19–20). Like *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, this treatise is written in the Doricized Greek common to other Pythagorean texts.

¹⁵ This text exhibits many of the characteristics of deliberative rhetoric, including the thesis statement. Such rhetorical structuring reveals the author’s knowledge of ancient rhetorical forms and features. Whoever the author was, she or he was thoroughly immersed in the moral-philosophical context. Thus, the text was written by an educated person, who was “herself” a teacher, communicating moral-philosophical ideas and arguing for their validity founded on the understanding of rhetoric as a persuasive tool. The thoughts and tone of the treatise have much in common with *Fragment 3* of Musonius Rufus, “That Women Too Should Study Philosophy”; these parallels have been examined by A.C. van Geytenbeek, who seems to believe that the name Phintys itself is masculine (*Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe* [rev. ed., trans. B.L. Hijmans, Jr.; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1963], 59).

¹⁶ γυναικὸς δὲ μάλιστα ἀρετὰ σωφροσύνη· διὰ γὰρ ταύτας τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀγαπὴν δυνασέται, Stob., *Anth.* 61 (W.-H. 589, 1–3).

¹⁷ This rhetorical strategy looks very similar to what *Rhet. Her.* describes as the *Distributio*: “The Distribution has two parts: the Enumeration and the Exposition. We shall be using the Enumeration when we tell by number how many points we are going to discuss. The number ought not to exceed three; for otherwise, besides the danger that we may at some time include in the speech more or fewer points than we enumerated, it instills [*sic*] in the hearer the suspicion of premeditation and artifice, and this robs the speech of conviction. The Exposition consists in setting forth, briefly and completely, the points we intend to discuss” (1.10.17, LCL; trans. H. Caplan). *On the Sōphrosynē* follows this pattern of enumeration first, then exposition. Oddly enough, five points are enumerated (more than *Rhet. Her.* recommends), but in the exposition numbers four and five appear to be collapsed into one exposition. Perhaps the original number was forgotten, as *Rhet. Her.* warned, yet the last two points simply express the same idea first in a negative, then a positive way.

deity. But of these the greatest and most essential cause of *sôphrosynê* is to be uncorrupted with respect to the marriage bed, and not to have intercourse with a strange man.¹⁸

Note that it is a woman “who is being educated” (παιδευομένην) who must learn about the “supreme virtue” of *sôphrosynê*, and that this process ought to result first and foremost in her remaining sexually faithful to her husband.

In this text, severe threats of divine and legal punishments serve to *dissuade* a woman from extramarital sex: she is warned especially not to disavow her marital promise to join her husband “in a life partnership and in the procreation of children according to the law.”¹⁹ In order to *persuade* (and educate) a woman toward *sôphrosynê* in this pre-DNA-testing society, the desirable consequence of her wifely faithfulness is promised: “But the best adornment and foremost glory of a married woman is that her *sôphrosynê* toward her husband is testified to through her own children, if they bear the image of the likeness of the father who begot them.”²⁰ Indeed, such a result would be noticeably apparent evidence of a woman’s sexual fidelity to her husband.

Modern readers might ask what a virtuous woman might be expected to gain from marital sex: (legitimate) children, physical enjoyment, and/or companionship. Malherbe states that *On the Sôphrosynê of a Woman* views the purpose of marital sex as “procreation.”²¹ While *On the Sôphrosynê* does point out that a woman’s marriage vow is for “a life partnership and for the procreation of children according to the law,” and although this may very well be the implicit viewpoint of the discourse, still it does not explicitly

¹⁸ διὸ δεῖ περὶ σωφροσύνας παιδευομένην γνωρίζεν, ἐκ πόσων τινῶν καὶ ποίων τοῦτο τάγαθὸν τῇ γυναικὶ παραγίνεται. φαιμί δὴ ἐκ πέντε τούτων· πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὴν εὐνὴν ὁσιότητός τε καὶ εὐσεβείας· δεύτερον δὲ ἐκ τῷ κόσμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸ σῶμα· τρίτον δ' ἐκ τῶν ἐξόδων τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας οἰκίας· τέταρτον δ' ἐκ τῷ μὴ χρεέσθαι τοῖς ὀργισμοῖς καὶ ματρωασμοῖς· πέμπτον δ' ἐν τῇ θυσίᾳ τῇ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλαβείᾳ ἥμεν καὶ μετρίαν. τούτων δὲ μέγιστον αἴτιον καὶ συνεκτικώτατον τῆς σωφροσύνης τὸ περὶ τὴν εὐνὴν ἡμεν ἀδιάφθορον καὶ ἄμικτον θυραῖω ἀνδρός, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 590, 1–11).

¹⁹ ἐπὶ κοινῶν βίῳ καὶ τέκνων γενέσει τῇ κατὰ νόμον, Stob., *Anth.* 61 (W.-H. 690, 15–16). Note that procreation is intended to produce “legitimate” heirs.

²⁰ κάλλιστος δὲ κόσμος γυναικὸς ἐλευθέρης πρῶτον τε κύδος τὸ διὰ τῶν αὐτῆς τέκνων ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι τὴν σωφροσύνην τὴν ποτὶ τὸν ἄνδρα, αἵκα τὸν τύπον τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἐπιφέρωντι τῷ κατασπείραντος αὐτῶς πατρός, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 591, 11–15). αὐτῆς is a contraction of ὁ αὐτῆς.

²¹ “Among the ways by which a woman learns this virtue are, most important, the holiness and godliness (ὁσιότητός τε καὶ εὐσεβείας) of the marriage bed (152, 20–21, 25), for procreation (τέκνων γενέσει; 153, 1–2) ...” (“The *Virtus Feminarum*,” 62; Malherbe is citing from Thesleff’s edition of *On the Sôphrosynê*); then, “Phintys connects *sôphrosyne* to marriage for the sake of procreation” (ibid., 63).

state that having children is the first or only purpose of sexual intercourse within a marriage.²² Certainly bearing children who resemble their legitimate father signals a woman's *sōphrosynē*, but again that does not mean that marital sex has procreation as its *only* objective. *On the Sōphrosynē* does not address a wife's sexual desire,²³ although it does emphasize the "life partnership" of a marriage. On the other hand, we have seen that *Theano to Nikostrate* encourages the intimacy, partnership, and companionship between wife and husband without any explicit link to procreation.

The four other enactments of the woman's *sōphrosynē*—her modest adornment, "expeditions" from her house, not participating in "women's rituals," and proper sacrifices to the gods—radiate out from the central source of marital faithfulness and are meant to reinforce the public, social perception that this wife is indeed not sexually "mixed up" (to translate the word ἄμικτον) with any man other than her husband.²⁴ In this culture, as in others, clothing, jewelry, and cosmetics signify social position, but also a woman's sexual availability or inaccessibility. Her modest adornment ensures that "she will provide honor both for her life-partner and for herself."²⁵ Similarly, going out of her house requires a woman to behave with reserve, not drawing suspicion on herself by leaving during the shadowy hours²⁶ which might

²² The goal of marital sexual intercourse is considered by many philosophers, among them the (pseudo)Pythagorean Ocellus Lucanus, who asserts that procreation of legitimate children gives reason to sex: "So it is first necessary to observe this one thing, that sexual intercourse is not for the sake of pleasure ... For those who have intercourse not at all for the sake of having children do injustice to the most revered systems of partnership," ἐν οὖν τούτῳ πρῶτον δεῖ θεωρεῖν ὅτι οὐχ ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα ἡ μίξις οἱ γὰρ καθάπαξ μὴ διὰ παιδοποιῶν συναπτόμενοι ἀδικήσουσι τὰ τιμιώτατα τῆς κοινωνίας συστήματα (*On the Nature of the Universe* 45; trans. Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, 232–233). I would note further that this text and many others considered by Deming and Malherbe address the issue of *men's* sexual behavior (whether it is good for *men* to marry and beget children), not that of women, as does *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman*.

²³ Plutarch advises a wife not to be sexually assertive with her husband: "A Spartan girl, when asked if she had yet come to her husband, replied, 'No, but he has come to me.' This is how the true housewife should be; she does not avoid or show displeasure with such things, if her husband takes the initiative, but neither does she take the initiative herself; the latter would be forward and more like a mistress than a wife, the former shows arrogance and lack of affection," Λάκαινα παιδίσκη, πυθνανομένου τινός εἰ ἤδη τάνδρῃ προσελήλυθεν, "οὐκ ἔγωγ'," εἶπεν, "ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ ἐκείνος," οὗτος ὁ τρόπος, οἶμαι, τῆς οἰκοδεσποίνης, μήτε φεύγειν μήτε δυσχεραίνειν τὰ τοιαῦτα τοῦ ἀνδρός ἀρχομένου μήτ' αὐτὴν κατάρχεσθαι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἑταιρικὸν καὶ ἱταμόν, τὸ δ' ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἀφιλόστοργον, *Advice, Mor.* 140C–D (trans. Pomeroy).

²⁴ The term θυραῖω ἀνδρός, "a man outside the doors," is an interesting way to refer to sexual trespassers.

²⁵ τὸν συμβιώντα καὶ αὐτὰν ἔντιμον παρέξεται, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 592, 14).

²⁶ The treatise advises this timeframe for a woman to leave her house: "Therefore not at early dawn nor at evening, but [she must] make the expedition when she is in plain sight after

suggest a sexual assignation, but to go out only “in order to perform public sacrifices to the founding-god of the city on behalf of herself and her husband and her whole house,”²⁷ or for an approved social event, or to purchase a household necessity. The wording of these instructions reminds the reader that the very fashion in which a woman makes “expeditions” from the house could intimate that she is not *sōphrōn* because she is not being faithful to her husband. Adding the admonition “to abstain from orgiastic rites and great mother celebrations,”²⁸ the author cites the illegality of these events, along with the negative examples that women might become drunk and/or subject to ecstatic experiences. Once again, a woman’s control of her sexual desires is linked to her manifestation of *sōphrosynē*. The treatise ends succinctly with this statement: “But it is necessary for the one who is the mistress of the house and who presides over the house to be *sōphrōn* and untouched in all respects.”²⁹ *Sōphrosynē* then is the supreme virtue for any woman to acquire. It is exhibited first and foremost in her sexual self-control, which means she will be faithful to her husband.

If the various elements of “the good woman” *topos* were mapped out, the virtue of *sōphrosynē* would be placed at the center of a woman’s very person, since, as *On the Sōphrosynē* asserts, “the supreme virtue of a woman is *sōphrosynē*.” But this virtue is essentially invisible until a woman puts on its requisite external signs.³⁰ First she wraps herself completely in sexual fidelity to her husband, which is in turn demonstrated by her visual appearance, her modest demeanor in adornment and speech. Two arenas of her everyday activities likewise manifest her *sōphrosynē*: within the household context she is a good mother and a just and wise *despoina*; outside the home she participates appropriately at religious rites while avoiding ostentation and public suspicion when she performs errands for the family. These “topographical” features are viewed as outer expressions of her inner virtuous character which, in turn, enact the virtue of her entire household. It is

the marketplace is teeming,” ἔπειτα μήτε ὄρφνας ἀνισταμένας μήτε ἐσπέρας ἀλλὰ πλαθυσάσας ἀγορᾶς καταφανεία γινομένας τὰν ἔξοδον, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 592,17–593, 2).

²⁷ τὰς δαμοτελέας θυηπολούσας τῷ ἀρχαγέτῃ θεῷ τὰς πόλιος ὑπὲρ αὐτὰς καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῷ παντὸς οἴκῳ, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 592, 15–17).

²⁸ ὀργιασμῶν δὲ καὶ ματρωασμῶν τῶν κατ’ οἶκον ἀπέχεσθαι, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 593, 6–7).

²⁹ τὰν δ’ οἰκοδέσποιναν καὶ προκαθεζομένην οἴκῳ δεῖ σώφρονα καὶ ἀνέπαφον ποτὶ πάντα ἡμεν, Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 593, 9–11). The word ἀνέπαφον seems to have a literal meaning: “not being touched,” in which case, the woman’s body as a sexual entity could be referred to again.

³⁰ Similarly, *Melissa to Kleareta* contrasts a woman’s inner and outer “resources”: “she must trust in the beauty and wealth of her soul rather than that of her looks and possessions,” lines 24–25.

thought to be impossible for an immoral woman to bring forth such embodiments of *sōphrosynē*, yet the virtue of a moral woman “naturally” extends from this vital core of her being.

As seen in North’s far-ranging compilation, many ancient texts discuss men’s practice of *sōphrosynē*, and sometimes one component of that practice is that a husband also ought to restrain himself from extramarital sex. In his *On the Pythagorean Life*, Iamblichus repeats the view that *sōphrosynē* is an essential virtue for both males and females, and that self-control of sexual lust is one element of this virtue (31.195.8; 31.210.15; 31.211.4). In fact, Iamblichus’ report of the speech of Pythagoras to the men of Kroton urges:

They should also be resolved that they would know only their wives, and that their wives should not adulterate the line because their partners neglect or injure them. A man should think that his wife was brought to him in the sight of the gods, like a suppliant, taken with libations from the hearth. He should set an example of discipline and *sōphrosynē* both to the household of which he is head and to those in the city.³¹

However, in most other ancient sources *sōphrosynē* is not so inextricably tied to the husband’s marital fidelity as it is to the wife’s.³² In point of fact, Phintys’ treatise *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman* argues this asymmetrical approach to virtue for men and women:

But I think that some things are characteristic for a man, and some for a woman, and some are common to man and woman, and some are more for a man than for a woman, and some more for a woman than for a man. On

³¹ σπουδάζειν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅπως αὐτοὶ τε μόνας ἐκείνας εἰδήσωσιν, αἳ τε γυναῖκες μὴ νοθεύωσι τὸ γένος ὀλιγωρίᾳ καὶ κακίᾳ τῶν συνοικούντων· ἔτι δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα νομίζειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας εἰληφότα μετὰ σπονδῶν καθάπερ ἰκέτιον ἐναντίον τῶν θεῶν εἰσῆχθαι πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ τῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ σωφροσύνῃ παράδειγμα γενέσθαι τοῖς τε κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν, ἣν οἰκεῖ, καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν, VP 9.48; trans. Clark (*Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Life* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989]).

³² For example, σωφρο- cognates appear eleven times Plutarch’s *Advice to the Bride and Groom*: once applied to the husband, once to the entire household, and nine times as a description of the good wife. In Antipater’s *On Marriage*, none of these terms are applied to a man’s role in the marriage. On the other hand, Ocellus Lucanus’ *On the Nature* does link male *sōphrosynē* with marital sex-for-procreation, indicating perhaps that men need to keep themselves under control from participating in illicit sex, and Musonius Rufus argues strongly that the virtue applies to both partners in marriage (Fr. 4). But the Pythagorean letter *Theano to Nikostrate*, which gives paraenesis to a wife whose husband has formed a liaison with an *hetaira*, nowhere calls his behavior a lack of *sōphrosynē*. He is described as committing an “injustice” (ἡ ἀδικία) against his wife, but not of acting immoderately. According to Pomeroy, “In the Hellenistic period there was slightly less tolerance of a husband’s philandering. Plutarch advises both husband and wife to abstain from extramarital intercourse, but in case the husband does indulge, he recommends discretion” (*Plutarch’s Advice*, 37).

the one hand, characteristic activities for a man are to serve as a general, and to take part in government, and to speak in the assembly. On the other hand, characteristic activities for a woman are to keep the house and to stay indoors and to wait for and to take care of her husband. And I say common things are courage [ἀνδρείαν], and justice [δικαιοσύνην], and practical wisdom [φρόνησιν]. For also it is fitting for both a man and a woman to have virtues of the body and likewise those of the soul. And just as it is beneficial for both to be healthy in body, thus [it is beneficial for both to be] healthy in soul. The virtues of the body are health, strength, keen perception, beauty.³³ Some [virtues] are more suitable for a man to train in and to possess, and some more for a woman. For courageous deeds and practical wisdom are more [suitable] for a man, both on account of the state of his body and on account of the power of his soul, but *sōphrosynē* [is more suitable] for the woman.³⁴

Here it is the wife who needs to act *sōphrōnōs* in regard to the entire sphere of the household,³⁵ while the husband is expected to move and to act in public arenas—military and political—from which women are supposedly restricted. This socially conventional thinking gives a partial rationale for why female *sōphrosynē* is primarily shown in a wife's sexual loyalty to her husband: marriage is the chief relationship of her adult life. As a result, *sōphrosynē* is *more* for a woman than for a man and plays a more integrative role in her moral development.³⁶

Reviewing the Pythagorean women's letters, we see that the *topos* of “the good woman” emerges from the epistolary occasions which reflect socially-conventional stages of a “woman's life”:³⁷ a recently-married young woman

³³ These four virtues of the body are the same bodily virtues that Theon lists as reasons for praise in an encomium (with the last two words reversed in order): ὑγεία, ἰσχύς, κάλλος, εὐαισθησία, *Prog.* 110.7 (cited by Theodore C. Burgess, “Epideictic Literature,” *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 [1902], 121).

³⁴ ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ μὲν τινα νομίζω ἀνδρὸς ἡμεῖν ἴδια, τὰ δὲ γυναικός, τὰ δὲ κοινὰ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός, τὰ δὲ μᾶλλον ἀνδρὸς ἢ γυναικός, τὰ δὲ μᾶλλον γυναικός ἢ ἀνδρὸς. ἴδια μὲν ἀνδρὸς τὸ στραταγὲν καὶ πολιτεύεσθαι καὶ δαμαγορεῖν, ἴδια δὲ γυναικός τὸ οἰκουρὲν καὶ ἔνδον μένειν καὶ ἐκδέχεσθαι καὶ θεραπεύειν τὸν ἄνδρα. κοινὰ δὲ φαμί ἀνδρείαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ φρόνησιν· καὶ γὰρ τὰς τῷ σώματος ἀρετάς ἔχεν πρέπον καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ τὰς ψυχᾶς ὁμοίως· καὶ ὡς ὑγιαίνειν τῷ σώματι ἀμφοτέροις ὠφέλιμον, οὕτως ὑγιαίνειν τῇ ψυχᾷ· σώματος δὲ ἡμεῖν ἀρετάς ὑγείαν ἰσχύος εὐαισθησίαν κάλλος. τὰ δὲ μᾶλλον ἀνδρὶ καὶ ἀσκήν καὶ ἔχεν οἰκείον ἐντι, τὰ δὲ μᾶλλον γυναικὶ. ἀνδρότατα μὲν γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν μᾶλλον ἀνδρὶ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τοῦ σώματος καὶ διὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὰς ψυχᾶς, σωφροσύνην δὲ γυναικὶ, *Stob., Anth.* 61 (W.-H. 589, 5–590, 1). As Nussbaum remarked, a similar set of arguments is made by Musonius Rufus: women and men should strive for (or be taught) the same virtues, but these will be enacted in different social arenas based on one's gender (“The Incomplete Feminism,” 300–301).

³⁵ As I have said, the connection of *sōphrosynē* to οἰκονομία is North's main point in “The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee”; see above n. 6.

³⁶ There is yet *sōphrosynē* for a man, but the treatise does not address this issue.

³⁷ Here it is helpful to recall that the letters explicitly address free women, i.e., those

in the cases of *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Kallisto* and a woman who has just become a mother in *Myia to Phyllis*. The other two letters take up what are thought to be “typical” female problems: a mother who is spoiling her children in *Theano to Euboule* and a wife whose husband has a liaison with an *hetaira* in *Theano to Nikostrate*. The topics covered verify the perception that moral progress for a woman materializes only within the boundaries of her domestic relationships and duties. Although outside these texts there is the expectation that the proper conduct of the wife-mother-*despoina* functions as a “public” sign of the propriety of the entire household, the woman’s activities are depicted nonetheless as limited to her household roles.³⁸ Such a woman would have ample opportunity, according to these letters, to practice *sōphrōn* behavior first in her marriage, childrearing, and *oikonomia*. She could learn self-control in order to model and transmit that to others in the household: her children, her wet-nurse, her female slaves, and even her husband.³⁹ With their sustained portrayals of what was thought to be a typical and moral woman’s life, along with the vivid examples of immoral women, the authors provide an ideal of womanhood, “the good woman,” that was effectively differentiated from expectations for the life of a typical and moral man.

While I have separated these four instructional components—texts, teachers and learners, methods, and topics—for the purposes of my analysis, the linkages between them work together to create a seamless literary product intended as a complete curriculum for the moral training of women. These texts have surfaced from the context of Greco-Roman philosophical education, as has been seen in their genre and their existence as collections (of pseudepigraphical letters) as well as in the evidence of rhetorical methods adapted to written forms. Their Pythagorean pseudonyms and

women whose legal status allowed them to contract marriages that would result in legitimate heirs to the husband’s property.

³⁸ An interesting analysis by Riet van Bremen shows how wealthy women’s very “public” benevolences to their cities are construed as “domestic” by means of extending the household roles into the city arena. Some of these women are then called “mother” of “daughter” of the city: “It is an important feature of the full-grown system of euergetism that the distinction between private and public life disappears; the private, domestic sphere, in all its aspects, overlaps increasingly with that of politics and public life” (“Women and Wealth,” in *Images of Women in Antiquity* [eds. Averil Cameron and Amélie Kuhrt; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993], 235).

³⁹ This is according to *Theano to Nikostrate*, “Therefore, when he is patiently attended by you he will be all the more ashamed, and he will wish to be reconciled quickly,” κατεργουμένος γοῦν ὑπὸ σοῦ μᾶλλον αἰσχύνεται, τάχιον δὲ διαλλαγῆναι θελήσει, lines 40–41.

pedigrees, along with their topics drawn from household ethics, similarly situate them in this philosophical context. Their subject matter fills in the map of “the good woman” *topos*. By addressing education for women in particular, these letters fill the niche created by earlier philosophical speculation about ethics in general, and the nature and moral capacity of the female sex in particular. They provide answers to the questions:

Can a woman be good? Yes, she possesses the human ability to become so.

What would that look like? She would be *sōphrōn* in her exclusive marital fidelity, modest adornment, good childrearing, and just household management.

And how could she become so? By reading and re-reading these letters in their collections, by imitating their renowned female teacher-authors, and by steering away from the behavior they censure while putting their ideal advice into practice.

These letters recommend good feminine qualities that are both specific and general at the same time. They are specific in that they focus on the presumed lives of women in their domestic roles, but they are general in that they are thought to be applicable to all women. This duality is like that which Milnor has found in a range of literature from the Augustan age: “... part of the ideological message of those texts is to portray women’s lives as ‘simple and similar’ when in actual fact they were not. We must understand that the domestic ideal was a construct which did not ‘truthfully’ represent any woman’s life, even at the same time as it purported to represent them all.”⁴⁰ The authors of the five Pythagorean letters not only express the same uncomplicated worldview of women’s lives, it is their persuasive and educational mission to compose textual resources and to present model teachers in order to hand down this very tradition of domestic feminine ideals. By such means, the authors seek to identify and even locate their female readers as “philosophers of the household.”

⁴⁰ *Gender, Domesticity*, 38. The phrase “simple and similar” comes from Milnor’s translation of a *laudatio* by the son of one Murgia: “For these reasons, since the praise of all good women is normally simple and similar ... and since it is enough that they all have done the same worthy deeds with a good reputation, and because it is difficult to find new kinds of praise for a woman, since their lives are disturbed by little variation, we praise their common virtues by necessity, lest, if something from among the proper precepts is left out, it should taint the rest” (*ibid.*, 31–32).

PART TWO

THE PASTORAL LETTERS

In Part Two, I compare the Pastoral letters with the corpus of Pythagorean women's letters in order to demonstrate how the Pastorals present a Christian adaptation of moral-philosophical training for female members of the author's intended audience. These comparisons are organized around the four identified components of the curriculum: texts, teachers and learners, pedagogical methods, and topics of instruction.

1. First I analyze how the individual Pastoral Letters, which were composed by a single author to be added to an already extant collection of Pauline letters, comprise a set of *textual resources* for the moral instruction of women, as well as men, in the assemblies.
2. As the pseudonymous sender of these letters, "Paul" serves as an exemplary older (male) *teacher*, with the named recipients "Timothy" and "Titus" constructed first as younger (male) *learners*, but also each presented as having been promoted to the role of Pauline teacher. This results in some ambiguity when the author considers who ought to serve as appropriate examples to be imitated by the women in the communities. Consequently, he decides that virtuous women ought to be exemplary *teachers* of *female learners*. Indeed, it is the *older* women who need to function as models for the *younger* women. This is the only teaching commission he endorses for female believers; he definitively prohibits them from teaching any men at any time.
3. Generally speaking, the Pastorals adopt the rhetorical style and aims of paraenetic letters as their *instructional methods*, with the authorial teacher reminding women (and men, and other social groups) of what they already may be presumed to know, and supporting much of his instruction by antithetical proofs.
4. While the contours of the real epistolary occasion for the Pastorals are obscured by the pseudepigraphical nature of the letters, the author nevertheless thought it necessary for his epistolary project to target the behavior of women. In that effort he finds it important to echo and to underscore the *subject matter*—the "good woman" *topos*—covered by other texts like the Pythagorean letters analyzed in Part One.

As with the Pythagorean letters, it is the interconnections between these four pedagogical components in the Pastorals that must be examined in order to understand the purpose of the Pastorals corpus as a (Christian) moral-educational curriculum, and, at that, a program with a special interest in training women. For instance, one connection arises from the relationship between the Pastorals and the other Paulines—what Annette Merz

characterizes as the “intertextuality” of the two corpora.¹ It seems clear that the Pastorals’ author (and almost certainly members of his community) had access to some version of the *Corpus Paulinum*.² However, some of the earlier Pauline teachings have apparently led to interpretations that were problematic in the view of the later epistolary author in that he perceived them as deviating from “healthy” Paulinist theology and practice. By means of a self-conscious borrowing of authorial name and personal details, of textual form³ (of letters, and those placed in collections), and of content (including instructions for women), the author made an attempt that was ultimately successful at providing a “correct” reading of the Paulines⁴ on the issues that were of concern to him and his audience. His ultimate success becomes evident in both the acceptance and canonization of the letters, as well as the historical application of his instructions, for example, prohibiting women from leadership and teaching roles in the churches for centuries to come.

Yet another interpretive difficulty comes from the fact of the Pastorals’ “double pseudepigraphy,” where neither the “real” author nor the putative readers correspond to the ostensible epistolary partners. And the effects

¹ *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*.

² Mitchell states that the Pastorals may be interpreted “as depending upon and referencing in various ways a published *corpus Paulinum* known to the author, and presumably also to his readership” (“Corrective Composition, Corrective Exegesis,” in *1 Timothy Reconsidered* [ed. Karl P. Donfried; Louvain: Peeters, 2008], 43). Here Mitchell cites in agreement the work of Edgar J. Goodspeed, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927); Albert E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941); and Peter Trummer, *Die Paulustradition der Pastoralbriefe* (BET 8; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1978) (“Corrective Composition,” 43 n. 10). Barnett’s work painstakingly examines “the data that reflect acquaintance with Paul’s collected letters” (*Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, x), and concludes: “The indications of this study are that the author of the Pastorals was acquainted with Paul’s letters as a collection and that he knew each of the ten letters that seem to have constituted the corpus There are no direct and formal quotations from Paul’s letters, but the language and ideas of Paul’s authentic writings are unmistakably used in many instances” (ibid., 277). As just two examples, Merz identifies 1 Cor 7:5, 14–16 as the “Prätext” of 1 Tim 2:15 (*Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 365–367), and Eph 5:22 ff. in the same relationship to 1 Tim 2:11–15 (ibid., 363–365). I discuss Merz’s conclusions more fully in various sections below.

³ Donald N. Penny remarks: “Perhaps it should go without saying that the author has cast his pseudonymous production as a letter of Paul, but it is instructive to note the points at which he has achieved conformity to the Pauline form” (“The Pseudo-Pauline Letters of the First Two Centuries,” Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1979, 92).

⁴ Mitchell calls the author’s work a “correction” of the Pauline tradition because “the term can encompass both emendation and confirmation of the text” (“Corrective Composition,” 44 n. 14).

of this pseudepigraphy proliferate further when one considers that: (a) the stated epistolary occasions must also be authorial constructions; (b) the designated geographical settings of Ephesus (for 1 and 2 Timothy) and Crete (for Titus) may be real place names, but are not necessarily clues for the readers (or to the historical career of Timothy or Titus); and, (c) the exact opinions and teachings of any opponents of the real author likewise remain opaque.⁵ The author has deliberately submerged the real occasion(s) for his letters by assimilating them to a fictitious reconstructed, and even idealized, past.⁶ Beyond this ideal vision for the church, modern readers must still assume that the author's composition paints a *realistic*, if not a *real*, picture of the dynamics and interactions of at least some Christian communities of his time and place: he fabricates a representation that would be historically plausible to his readers, offering a *mélange* of ingredients drawn from stories about and texts from Paul that are chosen for their particular applicability to the ecclesial situations he faced. That in the first centuries following their composition the Pastorals found audiences ready to accept their Pauline authorship means that these literary constructions effectively accomplished their author's purposes.

Whatever the situation on the ground, scholars have recognized that the letters take up a variety of problems as seen through the author's lens: (1) deceptive heterodox teachings of the opposition; (2) the adoption of ascetic lifestyles; (3) struggles over church leadership; (4) questions about church organization; (5) misuse of personal wealth; and (6) conflicts between the *ekklēsia* and those outside it. With respect to each one of these larger issues, the author explicitly addresses Christian women *qua* women.

- (1) *Heterodox opposition*: Although the author's opponents are uniformly depicted as male, women are seen their special targets (2 Tim 3:6–7),⁷

⁵ F.M. Young remarks with common sense: "... it is unlikely these letters are without situation, and ... the problems in the churches must have been real enough to have provoked the writing of these letters" (*Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 19). Quinn states: "The PE tend to resist questions about their background and origin, about when they were composed and by whom; from what place they were sent, to whom and where" (*Letter to Titus*, 17).

⁶ By putting prophetic words about the "future" in Paul's mouth the author is able to bring this Pauline past together with his own present in the letter. The fictional Paul is thus able to predict and deplore the very present situation, when he says, for example, "The spirit expressly says that in the last times some will apostasize from the faith, clinging to deceitful spirits and teachings of demons," Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, 1 Tim 4:1.

⁷ Reviewing the polemic about women in the PE, Karris conjectures that the author's opponents "may have had significant success among the womenfolk ..." ("The Background and Significance of the Polemic," 563).

possibly because of what the author perceives as their “weaker female nature,” as exemplified in mother-Eve (1Tim 2:13).

- (2) *Asceticism/marriage*: Some younger women have vowed to remain celibate, but then have been led astray by their own desires for marriage (1Tim 5:11–12).⁸
- (3) *Church leadership*: The author strongly forbids women from teaching or having authority over men, reserving church offices to males only (1Tim 2:12). Much other instruction covers male leaders in the communities, in the form of qualification lists, and in direct commands to Timothy and Titus; but, of course, both men and women would have heard all of the instructions as the letters were read aloud in the assemblies.
- (4) *Church order*: The author’s ideal organization of community life is based on the model of the Greco-Roman household, which model has been superimposed and then adapted for the ordering of relationships within the house churches. Thus, the Pastorals’ teachings in the name of Paul give apostolic justification for comparable traditional (and subordinate) female roles for women in the assembly (1Tim 2:11–15; 5:9–10, 14; 2 Timothy 1:5; Titus 2:3–5).
- (5) *Wealth*: Both men and women are the recipients of instructions about wealth in 1Tim 6:5–10, 17–18. However, women’s lifestyles appear to be singled out: some rich women may have had the resources that would have enabled them to purchase and use expensive bodily adornments (1Tim 2:9). Some widows are not “really widows” (i.e., poor widows), because they are living luxuriously (1Tim 5:6). Some “female believers” possess sufficient means to support widows financially (1Tim 5:16).
- (6) *Community reputation*: The actions of individuals are thought to influence the reputation of the whole community. So, while good behavior of men and slaves (of either sex?) is clearly encouraged (1Tim 2:7; Titus 2:7, 10), women’s decorous conduct also affects the social standing of the house churches (1Tim 5:14; Titus 2:5).

In each of the Pastorals the author’s attention turns to the moral conduct of women (1Tim 2:9–3:1a; 3:11; 5:3–16; 2Tim 1:5; 3:6–7; Titus 2:3–5), especially that of younger women. He seems to consider female persons to be the weakest links, the ones most liable to fail in virtue and most susceptible

⁸ This sketch of some apparently ascetic younger widows may be linked to an earlier statement where “forbidding marriage” is identified as one heretical teaching of the opponents (1Tim 4:1–5).

to moral deviance within the social network of the house churches and in its experience of larger society. The result is that while “women’s morality” was not the only problematic issue for the author (and his implied male readers), this subject is nonetheless central to his assorted teachings on virtuous behavior for all members of the communities, so central that he has provided more separate instructions especially for women than found in any other Christian text of the church’s first century.

My analysis demonstrates that in order to clarify and stabilize Paul’s earlier teaching on women in his later time and social context, the author first assumed the name of the revered apostle, and then took up “the good woman” *topos* and adapted it for his Christian women (and by extension for the men), so that they might make progress in a feminine version of the moral-philosophical curriculum. Furthermore, the Pastorals’ author followed ancient pedagogical conventions as he sought to teach his learners by means of letters, writing in a paraenetic style and using typical rhetorical strategies as instructional techniques. Since women as well as men were among his audience, he must have perceived both sexes to be susceptible to his educational approach. However, within the teaching-learning environment he outlines for the assemblies, the author strongly asserts gender-differentiated roles. First, all women are characterized as learners, and are prohibited from teaching men, while any man (with the exception of slaves?) might aspire to a teaching office. Second, because there is some discomfort with the idea of males (as identified with Timothy and Titus) teaching females, a special position is offered for older women, who, in fact, *must* teach younger women. Third, these older female teachers need to exemplify the behavioral expectations for younger women, whose conduct is also guided by other cited examples of moral and immoral women. And fourth, every woman needs to function within her traditional domestic positions of wife, mother, and *despoina*. For the author, a woman’s proper fulfillment of these social roles not only determines her standing in the *ekklēsia* and influences how that community is perceived by those outside. Even more, he believes that her very salvation depends upon it.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PASTORALS LETTER COLLECTION

Throughout the era of the post-Pauline church, questions about the moral practices of female believers persisted both outside and inside the assemblies. The activities of Christian women in particular came to the attention of second-century pagan commentators, among others, Pliny, Lucian, Galen, and Celsus.¹ Meanwhile, the internal discussions about marriage, divorce, celibacy, widows, and women's leadership are clearly represented in early Christian literature,² and within movements like Montanism, some forms of Gnosticism, and the venerators of Thecla. It is the author of the Pastorals, however, who first took up and re-interpreted Pauline instructions for and traditions of women's behavior, and then developed what he thought of as an improved curriculum for training those faithful women in virtue. He advanced his educational program by means of three interrelated textual resources: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus.

In this chapter, I argue that the Pastoral letters take the form of Pauline letters that have been composed by a single person in order to be included in an epistolary collection attributed to Paul. Because the three Pastorals were written by the same author, they provide consistent and reinforcing teachings about and for women. In point of fact, one of the most undeniable yet undervalued unifying links between the three Pastoral Letters is the consistent employment of nearly every element of "the good woman" *topos*, as mapped out at the end of Part One. Within each letter, the author's gendered worldview and particularly his teachings for women emerge in ways that distinguish his perspective from the other Paulines, even including the probably pseudonymous Colossians and Ephesians. The internal evidence regarding "good (Christian) women" demonstrates on yet another front that

¹ These are capably analyzed by Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman* (New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

² See also, e.g., Ignatius, *Polycarp* 4 and *Phil.* 4–5; Polycarp, *Phil* 4; 1 Clement 1–2, 21; *Gospel of Thomas* 5, 114; Hermas, *Vis.* 2, 4; *Mand.* 4.1; Justin, *Apologia* 2.2; *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, e.g., 7–20; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haeresus* 1.13; Tertullian, *On Monogamy*; *Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas*; and Clement, *Strom.* 4.8, 19, 20.

this small corpus was produced in relation to an earlier Pauline collection, so that its advice concerning women links to, clarifies, and even corrects that found in the other letters. In these ways, the author seeks to present the definitive re-interpretation of Paul's instructions regarding women in the *ekklēsia* (or, as 1 Timothy 3:15 has it, the οἶκος θεοῦ). By utilizing the textual form of (collected) letters, he extends Paul's epistolary educational enterprise wherein Paul had already adapted the moral-philosophical letter to the purpose of teaching early Christian communities. The resulting aggregated (and eventually canonical) corpus of Pauline letters, including the Pastorals, then functions as a sizeable *textual resource* for the moral instruction of believing women (and men). In this fashion, the Pastorals' author shares with the authors of the Pythagorean letters the perception that women's moral progress may be encouraged by means of instructional letters intended for reading and study as a collection.

TEXT HISTORY:

THE PASTORALS AS A SUB-COLLECTION WITHIN THE CORPUS PAULINUM

Consideration of the composition of the Pastorals as a unified letter-collection raises the question of their authorship: are they to be ascribed to Paul, to one of his co-workers, or to a pseudonymous author? Although from their earliest mentions in other Christian literature (beginning in the second century CE) the Pastorals were accepted by "orthodox" Christianity as letters from Paul himself,³ about two hundred years ago the idea arose that the author wrote pseudonymously.⁴ By the mid-twentieth century, a

³ Marcion does not include the Pastorals on his list of approved texts, nor do the Pastorals appear in P⁴⁶. For more discussion of this latter document, see n. 12 below.

⁴ "Friedrich Schleiermacher introduced the notion of non-Pauline authorship of the Pastorals to modern New Testament scholarship ..." (Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy*, 1). In an argumentative style, Johnson expands this statement: "The Pauline character and authenticity of these letters were not otherwise challenged seriously until the German theologian F. Schleiermacher in *Über den sogenannten Ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus* (1807) challenged the authenticity of 1 Timothy on the basis of its vocabulary ..., which Schleiermacher took as proof of composition after Paul's time. A more sustained attack on the authenticity of all three letters was launched by F.C. Baur in *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus* (1835), who argued that both the vocabulary and the historical setting were non-Pauline [T]he enormous prestige of Baur and the Tübingen School among historical critics helped the more radical position to become the dominant one The theory that the Pastorals are pseudonymous productions of the second century currently holds sway in NT scholarship

solid scholarly majority had agreed that they were not written by Paul.⁵ More recently, however, some scholars have argued for the authenticity of some, if not all, of the Pastorals.⁶ In particular, 2 Timothy, separately

except among some conservative scholars ..." (*Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 3–4). Jens Herzer reviews several works on the Pastorals, including Johnson's challenge to the so-called consensus, and concludes that interpretations that attempt to read the letters as a pseudepigraphic collection have not proved fruitful ("Abschied vom Konsens? Die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe als Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft" [*TLZ* 129, 12 (2004)], 1267–1282). Although I agree that the Pastorals would benefit from individualized attention, as with the Pythagorean women's epistolary corpus, the Pastorals ought also to be interpreted in light of each other (and alongside the other Pauline letters), as I explain below.

⁵ Aune summarizes the differing stances in "Pastoral Letters," *The Westminster Dictionary*, 338–339. Among others, these scholars accept the pseudepigraphy of the Pastorals: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* (1972); Verner, *Household of God* (1983); Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983); Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy* (1986); Fiore, *Function of Personal Example* (1986), and *Pastoral Epistles* (2007); Quinn, *Letter to Titus* (1990); F.M. Young, *Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (1994); Wagener, *Die Ordnung* (1994); Bassler, *1 Timothy*, *2 Timothy*, *Titus* (1996); Mitchell, "Reading to Virtue" (1998) and "Corrective Composition" (2008); Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung* (2004); Hans-Josef Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981) and *Ancient Letters* (2006). For at least 2 Timothy as a pseudepigraphon, see also Seán Charles Martin, "Pauli Testamentum": *2 Timothy and the Last Words of Moses* (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997).

⁶ Johnson strongly asserts Pauline authorship of all letters (*Letters to Paul's Delegates* [1996]; and *First and Second Letters to Timothy* (2001). Other permutations are suggested to account for the differences between the Pastorals and the authentic Paulines. Michael Prior claims that the distinctive elements of the Pastorals are due to the fact that Paul wrote them alone, rather than with a "co-author," or a secretary, who may have added their own contributions, so that the Pastorals are "private letters" from Paul's own hand (*Paul the Letter Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* [JSNTS 23; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989], 37–59). Towner claims that since the three letters are "letters to coworkers of Paul" (as opposed to letters to churches"), many differences of style and "historical situation" can be understood as arising from this different epistolary genre (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 2006); note that Towner's conviction about the individuality of the letters extends even to the title of his commentary, i.e., *not* "The Pastoral Letters," a fact he acknowledges, 2). Towner urges a "Farewell to 'The Pastoral Epistles'" (ibid., 88–89). Jerome Murphy-O'Connor follows the approach of Prior regarding 2 Timothy, stating, "realistically, the only scenario capable of explaining the acceptance of the Pastorals [by the later church] is the authenticity of one of the three letters. Were one to have been long known and recognized, then the delayed 'discovery' of two others with the same general pattern could be explained ..." (*Paul: A Critical Life* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1996], 357). This conclusion rests upon a strong differentiation of 2 Timothy from the more similar 1 Timothy and Titus, so that one might ask Murphy-O'Connor to describe how the three letters yet display "the same general pattern."

Of particular concern to many of these scholars are the possible motivations of the pseudonymous author: whether he intended to deceive his audience, or if he wrote letters under the name of Paul as a sign of humility and/or respect, perhaps serving as a respected teacher in his own right, one whose original audience knew what he had done. Donelson's

from 1 Timothy and Titus, is sometimes viewed as an authentic Pauline composition.⁷ Still for many decades, scholars have viewed the Pastorals as a corpus of pseudepigraphical letters. As I. Howard Marshall, who remains skeptical of Pauline authorship, definitively states:

Despite some dissent, the three letters are by one author. Any differences in character between them are due to the different situations addressed rather than to differences in author or thinking. This means that the letters can be considered together as a group of writings. They represent a common outlook with the kind of variations that one would expect to find in any group of writings by one author whose thought was liable to change and development.⁸

Most investigations of the Pastorals take into account both the similarities among them as well as what makes all three different from other Pauline

discussion of how commentators try to “explain” the motivations behind *Christian* pseudepigraphy remains significant (*Pseudepigraphy*, 9–22). Donelson concludes: “To believe oneself to be in accord with apostolic doctrine is not identical to believing oneself to be Paul or Peter. It does permit us to entertain the possibility that a forger thought he was saying what an apostle would indeed say if alive. More than likely, different forgers took different attitudes towards this question. Some may have indeed thought their deceptions were above criticism. Nevertheless, whatever their individual psychology on this point, they were still consciously employing a lie which they knew was potentially damaging if discovered. Thus we cannot conclude that forgery was ever innocently or naively done” (ibid., 20, n. 62).

Another issue driving at least some of the scholarship arguing for Pauline authorship of the Pastorals is that of biblical authority for the modern church. According to this argument, if these letters prove to be pseudonymous, they might be devalued as “not really from Paul,” and thus might acquire a reduced estimation for some believers: “In its sharper form, the decision against authenticity means that the Pastorals are automatically secondary (and perhaps even tertiary) witnesses to the Christian life, since they do not come from the first Christian generation. They are not technically outside the canon, but they may as well be for all the attention they receive, especially when elements in the Pastorals (such as their statements on women) are repugnant to present-day readers” (Johnson, *First and Second Letters*, 57). Of course, deciding that the Pastorals are Paul’s own work would not make their teachings about women any less “repugnant,” and the letters are still present in the NT canon at any rate.

⁷ Suggesting a theory of “allonymity” to account for the distinctiveness of the Pastorals vis-à-vis the other Paulines, Marshall asserts: “It may not be too much of an exaggeration to say that, if it were not for the existence of its two companions, it would be possible to develop a plausible case for the Pauline authorship of 2 Tim. The Pauline character of 2 Tim is patent. There are scholars who are prepared to defend its substantially Pauline character, whatever they make of the other two letters” (*The Pastoral Epistles*, 85–86). Although advocating pseudonymity for all three Pastorals, Dibelius and Conzelmann remark that 2 Timothy “... best fits our accustomed picture of the Pauline letter because 1) in 2 Tim, especially in the last chapter, the personal element is strongly emphasized, and 2) because the exhortations in the epistle really apply to the addressee and therefore can well be accounted ‘correspondence’” (*The Pastoral Epistles*, 1).

⁸ *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1.

letters.⁹ However, this approach has come under persistent attack in the last two decade, primarily from scholars who decry the lack of attention to the individual letters (especially 2 Timothy).¹⁰ As with the collected letters of Pythagorean women, my objective is to respect the individual characteristics of each of the Pastorals while providing justifications for interpreting them as a collection within the larger Pauline collection. Indeed it can be shown that they were composed with just such a reading strategy in mind.

Although it must be granted that the available manuscripts provide no evidence that the Pastorals ever circulated as a collection on their own, early on they are gathered together within the *Corpus Paulinum* on the basis of the nature of their addressees. The earliest extant documents in which all three letters appear¹¹ are the fourth-sixth century codices *Sinaiticus*, *Alexandrinus*, *C* and *D*¹² each of which places the Pastorals in their present canonical

⁹ Although the *differences* between the Pastorals and the undisputed Paulines are key to determining that the former are pseudepigraphic, that they were accepted as "Pauline" says that these letters were viewed as representative of Paul's tradition within the historical setting of the author and audience. The arguments made for "continuity" and "discontinuity" with the earlier Pauline correspondence are profitably reviewed by Merz (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 196–242, esp. 202–221).

¹⁰ The study of Ray Van Neste handles the three letters individually, searching for the internal coherence of each without much interest in their interrelationships (*Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles* [New York: T&T Clark, 2004]). Van Neste considers his work as a rebuttal of the "incoherence" found in the Pastorals by James D. Miller, *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents* (SNTSMS 93; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). S. Martin states "... [the] argument in favor of the authority of the letters *qua* collection rests on evidence which, however instructive it may be for the early history of the interpretation of the Pastoral Epistles, fails to shed much light on the individual letters themselves, or on the purposes for which they were composed" (*Pauli Testamentum*, 18). Besides Martin, other scholars have also treated 2 Timothy separately from 1 Timothy and Titus, among them: Prior, *Paul the Letter-Writer*; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "2 Timothy Contrasted with 1 Timothy and Titus" (*RB* 98 [1991]: 403–418); and Craig A. Smith, *Timothy's Task, Paul's Prospect: A New Reading of 2 Timothy* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2006).

¹¹ The earliest evidence for the Pastorals is found in the codex fragment P³², dated to the second-third centuries CE, and held by the Rylands Library of the University of Manchester. On the recto of P³² is found a section of Titus 1:11–15, while the verso preserves, serendipitously for my project, parts of Titus 2:3–8, including the instructions for older and younger women. No other fragments related to P³² have yet been discovered, so admittedly the papyrus provides no evidence for the Pastorals as a collection. The only other papyrus cited for Titus is P⁶¹, ca. 700 CE. There are no papyri cited for 1 or 2 Timothy in Nestle-Aland²⁷ or in, among others, Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), and David G. Martinez, "The Papyri and Early Christianity," in *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. Roger S. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 590–622.

¹² Along with 2 Thessalonians and Philemon, the Pastorals are missing from the early papyrus P⁴⁶, which otherwise contains parts of the Pauline letters nearly in what is now

order 1 Timothy – 2 Timothy – Titus, a group usually preceded by Hebrews¹³ and followed by Philemon. In his comprehensive analysis of the many relevant manuscripts, David Trobisch establishes that the arrangement of Paul's letters in either a thirteen- or fourteen-letter collection consisted of two sub-groups: the letters to churches are presented first, and the letters to individuals in the second.¹⁴ Reviewing the highly suggestive evidence for the

canonical order of Romans to 1 Thessalonians, with Hebrews inserted after Romans. Eldon Jay Epp carefully shows that with fourteen pages to be accounted for at the end of this papyrus, there would not have been enough room for all five “missing” letters, even though the scribe began to compress his script (“Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon,” in *The Canon Debate*, [eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002], 498–502). Thus, “we might all wish that P⁴⁶ provided the definitive answer to the presence or absence of the Pastorals in our earliest manuscript of the Pauline Letters, but so far it does not” (*ibid.*, 502). Likewise, the Pastorals and Philemon are not found with the other Paulines in the fourth-century *Vaticanus* manuscript. While it cannot be concluded that these four letters were missing from either P⁴⁶ or *Vaticanus*, their absence still suggests that in some way the Pastorals and Philemon occupy a distinctive position vis-à-vis the larger collection of Paul's letters.

¹³ The Claromontanus manuscript (D 06) places Hebrews after Philemon, according to David Trobisch (*Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik* [NTOA 10; Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989]; and *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994], 20).

¹⁴ Of course, Philemon only begins with a salutation to an individual (Philemon) then moves on to include Apphia and Archippus, and also “the assembly in your house” (τῇ κατ' οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ, Philemon 2), but the body of the letter is addressed to Philemon, which Trobisch notes (*Paul's Letter Collection*, 25). In his review of Trobisch's published dissertation, Eugene H. Lovering claims that Trobisch has neglected some sources: “In selecting nine corpus editions, he is forced systematically to dismiss every sequence which deviates markedly from the canonical one (there are at least thirty such orders)” (Review of *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik*; *JBL*, 110:4 [1991], 736). Trobisch seems to refute that statement in his shorter English book, saying, “I dedicated two years of my doctoral studies I checked all reports of unusual sequences that I could find, including existing manuscripts, reconstructed ancestors of extant manuscripts, old commentaries, citations by ancient Christian writers, the oldest translations, the lists of canonical writings issued by the Old Church and the very first references to the letters of Paul in Christian literature. As far as I know, this is the most comprehensive survey of this question ever made” (*Paul's Letter Collection*, 21). My survey of the various sequences found in Grosheide, *Some Early New Lists of the Books of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), in Trobisch's *Paul's Letter Collection*, and in the lists and catalogs from Lee Martin McDonald's Appendix D (Tables D-2, D-3, and D-4) of *The Canon Debate* (eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), confirms that each early manuscript and list that names the letters in a (thirteen- or fourteen-letter) Pauline collection groups the Pastorals together. The “marked deviations” referred to by Lovering involve either Hebrews or some other Pauline letter (e.g., Colossians in Jerome's and Augustine's lists, and several anomalies in the *Muratorian Fragment*). For another list of sequences of Pauline letters, see Lovering, “The Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation of the Corpus Paulinum,” Table 2 (PhD. diss., Southern Methodist University, 1989), 259–262.

ancient theory that Paul wrote to seven churches, Harry W. Gamble concludes that “this idea almost certainly rests on an actual early edition of the letters that presented them as ‘letters to seven churches.’”¹⁵ This is confirmed by the fact that Pauline letters appear generally on the sequence of longest to shortest (although letters to the same addressee stand next to each other).¹⁶ Therefore, since 1 Timothy is quite a bit longer than 2 Thessalonians, Quinn assumes that this point in the present canonical order “... marks the seam where two second-century collections of Pauline letters were joined ...”¹⁷ Yet Seán Charles Martin notes the weakness in this argument: the manuscript evidence does not show that “by the end of the second century the Pastoral Epistles were circulating as a letter collection, with the implicit claim to authority with which Quinn would like to invest them.”¹⁸ Thus the most that can be gleaned from the manuscripts—but this is not insignificant—is that 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus (and Philemon) are consistently grouped together after the Pauline letters to churches.

Similarly, among the lists of scriptures from the fourth century that name the individual Pauline letters,¹⁹ all maintain the two-part arrangement described by Trobisch: (1) Athanasius’ Paschal letter of 367; (2) Jerome, *Ep.* 53;²⁰ (3) Augustine, *Doct. chr.* 2.8–9, 12–14; (4) Amphilochius, *Iambi ad Seleucum*;²¹ (5) the Syrian Catalog of St. Catherine’s; (6) the *Muratorian Fragment*²² (which categorizes the Pauline letters in two groups: letters to seven

¹⁵ *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 59.

¹⁶ Trobisch, *Paul’s Letter Collection*, 25. While the principle of descending length for the arrangement of the letters to “individuals” seems to hold true, such is not the case for all manuscripts containing the letters to churches, as Epp carefully details (“Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon,” 505–507).

¹⁷ *Letter to Titus*, 3.

¹⁸ “*Pauli Testamentum*,” 18. Here he is responding to Quinn’s claim that “regardless of whether any of the Pastoral Epistles enjoyed an individual preexistence, at least since the second century, and perhaps as early as the first, they were always read as a collection” (ibid., 17; summarizing Quinn’s position, *Letter to Titus*, 3, 8).

¹⁹ I have drawn my conclusions from McDonald’s “Lists and Catalogs of New Testament Collections” (Appendix D, Table D-2, *The Canon Debate*), and from the edition of twelve of these sources submitted by Grosheide (*Some Early Lists*). It is most probable that the lists that simply note the presence and number of Paul’s letters (either thirteen or fourteen) also know the collection in this two-part sequence.

²⁰ Anomalously, Colossians follows 1 and 2 Thessalonians in Jerome’s and Augustine’s lists, immediately preceding 1 Timothy.

²¹ Amphilochius notes that there are questions about 2 Peter, 2–3 John, Hebrews, Jude, and Revelation (McDonald, Appendix D, Table D-2, *The Canon Debate*, 594).

²² Here Philemon is mentioned first, followed by Titus and the two letters to Timothy. The early (second century) dating of this document has been under serious attack on several

churches and to four “individuals”); and (7) the Synod of Laodicea. The pattern persists in the few lists from the fifth to sixth centuries²³ indicating that at least this aspect of the sequence of the scriptures had become customary.

Second-century authors who quote the Pastorals as individual letters (Ignatius, possibly;²⁴ Polycarp and *1 Clement*, probably;²⁵ Irenaeus and Athénagoras certainly²⁶) do not refer to or list them as a *collection*.²⁷ Yet, signif-

fronts: linguistic, geographic, historical, and content (especially regarding its comments about the *Shepherd of Hermas*). Albert C. Sundberg, Jr. argues for the later dating of the *Fragment* (“Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List” [*Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973)]: 1–4). Gregory Allen Robbins summarizes the debate: “Muratorian Fragment,” *ABD* 4: 928–929. Clare K. Rothschild provides a comprehensive review of scholarship on the document, and concludes that the fragment is a deliberate forgery purporting to be a second-century text (Presentation at Society of Biblical Literature, November 2008). A shorter assessment that advocates for the earlier date may be found in Peter Balla, “Evidence for an Early Christian Canon (Second and Third Century)” (*The Canon Debate*, 381–382). In Appendix D, Table D-2 in that same volume, McDonald appears to accept the fourth-century dating, because he places the *Fragment* with other lists from that time.

²³ See Appendix D, table D-3, *The Canon Debate*, 596. One anomalous list comes from Eucherius, *Instructiones*, which is missing Galatians, 2 Thessalonians, Titus and Philemon, but 1 and 2 Timothy are still grouped together at the end of the collection.

²⁴ Quinn questions whether Ignatius knew the text of the Pastorals (*Letter to Titus*, 3), while Merz argues the opposite (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 141–187). She cites such parallels as ἐκτρέπειν in Ign. *Magn.* 11 as well as 1 Tim 1:6; 5:15; 6:20; 2 Tim 4:4; ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν in Ign. *Pol.* 3.1 and in 1 Tim 1:3; 6:3; the similar language in Ign. *Phld.* 1.1 (μάταια λαλούντες) to 1 Tim 1:6 (ματαιολογία) and Titus 1:10 (ματαιολόγοι); and Ign. *Smyrn.* 7.1 (συζητούντες) to 1 Tim 1:4; 6:4; 2 Tim 2:23; Titus 3:9 (ἐκζητήσεις) (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 158–159). Mitchell is rightfully doubtful of Merz’ claim, “esp. the weak instances of verbal connection adduced on pp. 159–161” (“Corrective Composition,” 45, n. 15). In any case, Ignatius does seem to know of some collection of Pauline letters that he imitated by writing a letter corpus of his own.

²⁵ According to Quinn, Polycarp “almost certainly quoted the Letters to Timothy in his *Phil.* 4.1, perhaps as early as 120 CE” (*Letter to Titus*, 3). One likely citation of 1 Timothy is found in Poly. *Phil.* 4.1: “We have brought nothing into the world, but we have nothing to take out [of it],” οὐδὲν εἰσηγάχαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐξεγενεῖν τι ἔχομεν (cf. 1 Tim 6:7: οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηγάχαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξεγενεῖν τι δυνάμεθα). The vocabulary and syntax of these statements bear a much stronger similarity to each other than the supposed parallels lifted up between Ignatius and the Pastorals. Towner notes Polycarp’s attestations to 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus and concludes that “Polycarp’s knowledge and use of the Pauline corpus as a whole further suggest that the letters to Timothy and Titus were regarded as part of that collection” (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 4). However, Towner insists that the Pastorals not be read as a corpus of their own (*ibid.*, “Introduction”).

²⁶ These two sources at least provide a secure *terminus ante quem* earlier than that of the manuscript evidence.

²⁷ Towner summarizes this situation of historical attestation: “... the indicators confirm that the three letters were known and used—as Pauline writings—prior to the time of Polycarp (110–135; and possibly by the time of *1 Clement*) and consistently afterward through the early centuries of the church” (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 5).

icantly, Tertullian (along with Marcion?) does perceive the Pastorals as a grouping within Paul's letters to individuals when he claims:

On the Epistle to Philemon. This epistle alone has so profited by its brevity as to escape Marcion's falsifying hands. As however he has accepted this letter to a single person, I do not see why he has rejected two written to Timothy and one to Titus about the church system. I suppose he had a whim to meddle even with the number of the epistles.²⁸

Rather than deliberating why Marcion might have rejected the Pastorals, or whether he even knew of their existence,²⁹ the important point is this: Tertullian understood that the Pastorals had one characteristic in common with Philemon (the single addressee), while the three also shared a unified purpose: the topic of church order.³⁰

In sum, the textual and historical evidence shows that (1) "no single Pauline letter [including the Pastorals] has been transmitted to us in isolation; each is found only in collections";³¹ and yet, (2) 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, along with Philemon, constitute a second grouping within each extant manuscript or specific list of the Pauline letter collections. Even Towner, who forcefully rejects the idea of a Pastoral corpus, concedes that the three letters are to be distinguished from the letters to churches because of their "ecclesiastical thrust."³² He resorts to calling them a "*cluster* in distinction from the other letters of Paul," and refers to their "*cluster* relationship" with each other.³³ I am unconvinced that Towner's choice of "cluster" is much of

²⁸ De Epistula Ad Philemonem. Soli huic epistulae brevis sua profuit ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem litteras factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit. Affectavit, opinor, etiam numerum epistularum interpolare, *Adv. Marcion* 5.21 (ed. and trans. Ernest Evans; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972). A similar view as to the grouping of the Pastorals comes from Augustine, who wrote: "He who is placed in the role of church teacher should have these three apostolic epistles before his eyes," *Quas tres apostolicas epistolas ante oculos habere debet, cui est ecclesia doctoris persona imposita* (*Doctr. Christ.* 4.16; translation by my University of Dubuque colleague Melinda Thompson).

²⁹ Towner's summary of this issue is suggestive; he believes that Marcion intentionally omitted 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus "even if his precise reasoning for this remains obscure" (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 5). However, we do well to remember that this is an assumption based on silence, as Lovering warns ("Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation," 201).

³⁰ Tertullian's characterization is interesting given that 2 Timothy is commonly thought to contain little about church organization.

³¹ Klauck, *Ancient Letters*, 330; my insertion.

³² *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 6, 88. He does not include Philemon in this "cluster" because of differences in addressees: Timothy and Titus are Paul's "co-workers" whereas, presumably, Philemon is not (*ibid.*, 89).

³³ *Ibid.*, 89; my italics. Towner states that he has taken the term "cluster" for the Pastorals from Johnson, although he does not cite the reference (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 30).

an improvement over the terms “sub-collection” or “mini-collection” or even “group,” since each term points toward the commonalities among the three letters in contradistinction to the other Paulines.

Much of the history of the composition, collection, and possible redaction of what we now know as the Pauline letter collection remains a matter of scholarly conjecture. Eugene Harrison Lovering theorizes about the early decades of the collecting process, arguing that there was a “continuous circulation” of various Pauline letters so that “there was no sudden ‘initial collection’ but rather a process of gradual collection”³⁴ According to Lovering, the failure to identify one *single* site for the origin of the corpus means that we should expect to find various sizes of collections:

But if we remove the term ‘single,’ the conclusion changes; for it is entirely likely that places of corpus origins can be identified with confidence. Suggestions like Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch, Rome, and the places of lodging and ministry for travelling disciples are all possibilities.³⁵

³⁴ “Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation,” 237. In agreement with this position he cites: Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 2nd ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1919); Percy Neal Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936); Nils A. Dahl, “The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church,” in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullman zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (NovTSup 6; Leiden: Brill, 1962: 261–271); and F.F. Bruce, “Some Thoughts on the Beginning of the New Testament Canon” (*BJRL* 65 [1983]: 37–60). (Lovering also mentions in passing that Hans Lietzmann and Günther Zuntz, share this position, but does not cite their specific works, *ibid.*, 328). Lovering is especially and, I think, correctly opposed to the theories of Edgar Goodspeed and the “Chicago school,” who posited a period of neglect and disinterest in Paul’s letters followed by their fabulous “revival” based on the composition and subsequent popularity of the book of Acts (see Lovering’s survey and critique, *ibid.*, 188–221, 286–301). However, I still find some merit in Goodspeed’s thought that Pauline letter collections prompted other authors to write more than one letter: “The influence of the Pauline corpus as a collection upon the literary forms of the generation that followed its formation is evidenced not only by the surprising revival of the letter form of religious instruction but by the appearance of *other letter collections*, which show every sign of its direct influence” (*New Solutions*, 43; my italics).

Trobisch asserts that the first edited edition, “Paul’s authorized recension” (a group with Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians), was made by Paul himself, with the placement of Ephesians after Galatians an indication of where new letters began to be attached (*Paul’s Letter Collection*, chs. 3 and 4). This hypothesis does not necessarily contradict the historical reconstruction by Lovering, since “Paul’s recension” might have become one of those circulating collections. Trobisch’s argument for this small early collection, and even my brief suggestion about the attachment of the Pastorals to a Pauline collection, may be thought to fulfill Lovering’s call for further investigations: “If the evidence points consistently to a gradual growth of the Pauline corpus, it certainly does not provide us with a detailed picture of that growth; there is plenty of work yet to be done” (“Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation,” 347).

³⁵ Lovering, “Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation,” 316; also, 336–341.

Thus, the development of the Pauline corpus could be explained by (1) regional variations in the composition of, knowledge of, and access to Pauline letters, which were driven by (2) a motivation for churches to acquire additions to their collections. Lovering call this drive “the impulse toward comprehensiveness,” which means that “as each new and apparently genuine letter of Paul became known, it would have been added to the letters already possessed.”³⁶ The order of the letters that were available for the longest period of time and in the widest distribution would stabilize, while later and less well-known letters would exhibit more variability within the sequence.³⁷ This “disorganized” pattern fits well with the historical situation of inter-church relationships where “churches were notably independent and unlikely to have agreed readily on anything, least of all a newly circulating Pauline corpus.”³⁸

Extrapolating from Lovering’s description of the circumstances surrounding the Pauline collection, I suggest a solution to the main text historical problem regarding the Pastorals as a corpus: the absence of evidence for their independent circulation. If it is true that even late in the first century there was no standardized Pauline epistolary corpus, the author could have composed his three letters and immediately attached them to a collection,³⁹ perhaps the group Gamble calls the “letters to seven churches” edition,⁴⁰ that was available in his particular geographic area.⁴¹ Such a compositional exploit would clarify why the manuscript record shows no instances when the Pastorals circulated on their own. After the production and first

³⁶ Ibid., 278. This aggregation occurs because “... exchange of letters would have been customary from an early stage and that by a natural process regional collections would have gained comprehensiveness as they encountered other letters and letter collections. At some point, somewhere, a collection came to contain all the surviving letters, but that ‘comprehensiveness’ need not have been attained only once or thereafter have been universally influential” (ibid., 327).

³⁷ Ibid., 327. Lovering concludes that the Pastorals probably existed as a smaller corpus (ibid., 200–201), but he pays more attention to the position of Ephesians within the corpus (ibid., 172–196).

³⁸ Ibid., 328.

³⁹ It seems possible to me that the larger pre-existing collection might have ended with Philemon, the brevity of which would make it fairly easy for the Pastorals to be inserted immediately before it. Alternatively, perhaps the principle of arranging the letters from longest to shortest came into play, especially as the Pastorals were more widely distributed, so that Philemon was easily moved to the end of the collection.

⁴⁰ *Books and Readers*, 59–61.

⁴¹ Ephesus is often suggested as the place where the Pastorals were composed, as “Paul” writes to Timothy there (1 Tim 1:3). Of course, Crete is stated as the receiving geographic area for Titus (1:5).

distribution of the Pastorals within a larger collection, churches in that and other regions, out of the “impulse toward comprehensiveness,” could have eagerly received them as part of an authentically Pauline corpus. Such an uneven historical process⁴² would clearly work to the advantage of the author of the Pastorals by providing an accommodating context for the composition of the letters which helps to account for his ultimate success as a Pauline pseudepigrapher.

That the Pastorals are unique in being addressed to Timothy and Titus, the heirs of the Pauline tradition, and not to Christian assemblies, may have even increased their attractiveness to collectors of Paul's letters.⁴³ Certainly it might have been supposed that the named recipients had retained Paul's private letters to them and these were only “discovered” later, perhaps after their deaths. This presumed fact would justify what might seem like the recent arrival of these components of the larger Pauline corpus, and maybe would set to rest any concerns about their authorship because their origins could be traced to the second-generation of Pauline leadership. In addition, the known close relationship between Paul and the addressees would make it even more “logical” to maintain their proximity to each other in the larger collection, and thus gives another reason for the historical arrangement of the letters into two groups.

One way to corroborate and amplify the textual relationship of the Pastorals to some already circulating corpus would be to determine what and how many Pauline letters the Pastorals' author might have known.⁴⁴ Merz's study of the intertextuality of the Pastorals' suggests that the author possessed at least several other Pauline letters.⁴⁵ Her case studies of 1 Tim 2:9–

⁴² Merz seems to lean in this direction: “Es ist also damit zu rechnen, dass Paulusbriefsammlungen mit und ohne Corpus Pastorale in den Gemeinden nebeneinander in Gebrauch waren” (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 76–77).

⁴³ The “private” nature of these three letters might be thought to account for many of the differences between them and the other Paulines. Another attraction would surely have been their treatment of issues germane to a later first-century audience.

⁴⁴ Of course, to start with, the author knew that Paul wrote letters, and that Timothy and Titus were trusted subordinates within Paul's missionary movement. The Corinthian correspondence does much to establish the prominence of these two men (Timothy: 1 Cor 4:17; 16:10–11; 2 Cor 1:1, 19; Titus: 2 Cor 2:13; 7:6–7, 13–15; 8:6, 23; and 12:18).

⁴⁵ Merz accepts Trummer's conclusion that the Pastorals' author composed his three letters in order to complete “ein schon recht umfangreiches Corpus Paulinum” (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 76; referring to “Corpus Paulinum—Corpus Pastorale: Zur Ortung der Paulustradition in den Pastoralbriefen,” in *Paulus in den neutestamentlichen Spatschriften* [ed. K. Kertelge; QD 89; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1981], 122–145). Lovering would stress that the corpus known to the author of the Pastorals would probably differ from those found in other regions and times: “... we are not in the position to say that if the corpus was known in

3:1a and 6:1–5 demonstrate that the author of the Pastorals alludes to “pre-texts” found in at least these letters in the Pauline collection: 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon.⁴⁶ Extending Merz’s conclusions in an examination of 1 Tim 2:1–8, Mitchell finds that here the Pastorals’ author has utilized material on prayer from Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians.⁴⁷ The fact that the pseudepigrapher draws upon Pauline letters and history shows that he considers himself an heir to the Pauline tradition, however “un-Pauline” his interpretation of that tradition might seem to be to later scholars.⁴⁸

If all my hypotheses are valid, then the Pastorals *never* circulated as individual letters *nor* as a collection separate from some other letters purportedly from Paul,⁴⁹ even though they are, as can be satisfactorily determined on other grounds, composed by one and the same author. This would explain why later manuscripts and readers attest to the Pastorals as a smaller set traditionally positioned after the letters to seven churches all together comprise a larger (thirteen- or fourteen-letter) Pauline collection.

This historical situation is comparable to that of the two smaller collections of letters (*MM* and *TH*₃) by Pythagorean women. Not one of these letters is ever found on its own, and they exhibit some stability in their ordering: the letter of Melissa often comes first, almost always followed by *Myia* to *Phyllis* (the only exception is in *P.Haun.* II.13), with the three letters attributed to Theano gathered into the same sequence in all available Renaissance manuscripts. Overall, their female authors, addressees, and subject matter supply their common bonds, while the Pauline corpus holds together, of course, first on the basis of the respected name of the apostle, and is then arranged by subject matter (letters to churches, letters to individuals).

one place it was equally known in all others or that if a letter was part of the corpus in Asia it was also part of the corpus in Rome” (“Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation,” 341).

⁴⁶ Ibid., 258–267, 333–367, 372–375.

⁴⁷ “Corrective Composition,” 48–56. Mitchell asserts that the letter to the Romans is especially important to the author of 1 Timothy, and she identifies intertextual references in, e.g., Rom 9:1; 10:1–2; 12:1, 18; 13:1–7 (ibid., 50–54).

⁴⁸ For a comprehensive survey of scholars’ assessments of the author’s Paulinism, see Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 202–222.

⁴⁹ This conclusion does not get us any closer to a final determination of whether the author *intended* to compose these three letters as a collection in and of themselves, a determination S.C. Martin says is impossible (“*Pauli Testamentum*,” 18). Martin’s assertion is to be understood in the context of his rejection of Quinn’s idea that “the first implicit claim to authority ... involved sending not one letter in the name of Paul, but a *collection* of letters” (ibid., 17).

INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE PASTORALS CORPUS

Since what binds the Pastorals together as a corpus is only partially indicated by the textual evidence, further claims must be advanced on internal grounds. Many divergences from the other Pauline letters have been noted in the history of scholarship: in language, style and structure of argumentation, theological statements, and ethical issues addressed. It is the large number and cumulative weight of the differences between the Pastorals and the Paulines that point to a single author for the Pastorals, one who is not the historical Paul.⁵⁰

For example, the vocabulary and syntax vary significantly from the earlier Paulines while remaining consistent across the Pastorals.⁵¹ In addition to

⁵⁰ Many scholars acknowledge the distinctiveness of the Pastorals, but attribute this to some differing process of authorship. Prior argues that after authoring many letters with others, Paul wrote these letters *without* a secretary (*Paul the Letter Writer*). However, other commentators suggest an “amanuensis theory,” with various persons in this role (Tychicus, Luke, Timothy, or Titus): e.g., Joachim Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (NTD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1934; 1963); Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 199–200; C.F.D. Moule, “The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal,” in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982): 113–132; repr. from *BJRL* (1965): 430–452; W.D. Mounce, *The Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Dallas: Word, 2000), cxxix, with review and critique of various authorial theories, cxviii–cxxvii. This idea is also a part of Marshall’s theory of “allonymity” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 83–92).

⁵¹ For further evidence, see the analysis in Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 3–6, and his excursions on the choice and use of terms in the Pastorals, 271–315. Quinn’s excursions on several linguistic distinctions found in the Pastorals also definitively show the author’s separation from the other Pauline letters (*Letter to Titus*, 271–315). These cover: *pistis* terminology, truth and *epignōsis alētheias*, *eusebeia* and cognates, terminology for “life,” and the use of the *sō(s)-cluster of terms.

P.N. Harrison’s important study notes the high number of both Pauline and New Testament *hapax legomena* which suggests a different author than Paul (“The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles,” *ExpTim* 67 [1955–1956]: 77–81). Harrison counted 305 words found in the Pastorals, but not the other Paulines (*ibid.*, 77). Quinn observes that about one-third of the words in the Pastorals do not appear in the other Paulines, and nearly one-fifth are singular in the NT (*Letter to Titus*, 4). The use of many of these words by second-century authors indicates a later date than the other Paulines (P.N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921], ch. III; discussed in Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 60).

Then too the “peculiar” terminology of the Pastorals has “affinities with the more literary traditions in Hellenistic Greek” (Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 4). His finding is supported by Dibelius and Conzelmann: “Much more important than bare statistics is the fact that the Pastorals’ vocabulary belongs mainly to the higher Koine. Therefore, when compared with the whole of Hellenistic Greek it appears to be less peculiar than the vocabulary of the rest of the NT. This fact argues strongly against the authenticity of the Pastorals” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 3).

Even Marshall, who would prefer to maintain some sort of “non-pseudonymity” for the Pastorals admits: “Despite the weaknesses in presenting it, there is some substance in the

these distinctives, the tone of the Pastorals lacks the distinctive energy that appears in the authentic Paulines.⁵² This shift in tone derives from the fact that the imperative commands are almost all given in the second-person singular, that is, to Timothy and Titus. The “commands” to other persons and groups in the presupposed audiences take shape as a later stage of instruction, progressing from “Paul’s” delegates to “faithful men” and thence to the assemblies (2 Tim 2:1). Such commands are thus framed in the less direct syntax of third-person imperatives, and infinitive and participial constructions (e.g., 1 Tim 2:1, 8, 9, 11–12; 5:14, 16; 6:17–19; Titus 1:7–9; 2:2–10; 3:1–2), which creates a less forceful tone in all three letters simply due to the mediated process of communication.⁵³

Another substantial distinction of the Pastorals is the structure of their argumentation: unlike the other Paulines, the letters seem to be constructions of patchwork sections of varying origins, lengths, and contents whose

case developed by Harrison and others: the shape of the vocabulary of the PE is different from that of the genuine Pauline letters. Each of the PE shows a relative high ratio of [unusual?] vocabulary to total word count” (ibid., 61). Towner says that such vocabulary differences are improperly cited as evidence for pseudonymity, but never systematically explains how this evidence might be seen otherwise (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 14). Yet Towner is not satisfied with Pauline authorship either, and finds Marshall’s idea of *allonymity* as “not an unattractive alternative” (ibid., 26; cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 79–84). Considering the links between the vocabulary of the Pastorals and that of Luke-Acts, Johnson concedes “It would be more accurate to say that both Luke and the Pastorals reveal a broader sample of Koine Greek than is attested in the undisputed letters” (*Letters to Timothy*, 69).

⁵² I am not sure I would go as far as Quinn, who states: “The PE read in a calm, slow, colorless, monotonous fashion. Their tone is sententious, stern, didactic, sober, stiff, domesticated ...” (*Letter to Titus*, 6). Certainly there are some occasional flashes of emotion: the designation of Timothy and Titus as “genuine children” (1 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4; cf. also 1 Tim 1:18; 2 Tim 1:2); the imperative commands to Timothy (e.g., 1 Tim 4:11–16), and Titus (e.g., Titus 2:1, 15); inflammatory descriptions of opposition (e.g., 1 Tim 1:20; 2 Tim 3:6–9; the itchy ears of 2 Tim 4:3); and “Paul’s” evocative self-representation as a person of feelings and longings (1 Tim 3:14; 2 Tim 1:3–4, 16; 3:11; 4:6, 9–11, 16). Many of the theological/creedal statements and blessings are elegantly phrased and memorable (e.g., 1 Tim 1:15–17; 2:5–6; 3:16; 2 Tim 2:11–13; Titus 2:11–13). Even the Pastorals’ slogan *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* (1 Tim 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11; Titus 3:8) might be seen as dignified and strong, rather than monotonous. Even Quinn notes the author’s use of rhetorical figures and, at times, a “poetic rhythmic structure” (ibid.).

⁵³ For those committed to the authenticity of Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, this change in tone makes eminent sense and may be attributed to the difference in stated recipients—the letters to churches envision a group audience from the beginning, while the Pastorals are letters to individuals who are themselves supposed to pass on the instructions contained therein. However, the Pastorals are clearly composed for a wider readership than just Timothy and Titus. The letter to Philemon, also supposedly addressed to an individual, evidences Paul’s livelier personal style when writing to an individual whose assembly is reading over his shoulder.

logical organization has historically been difficult to discern.⁵⁴ Not many commentators have carefully investigated or employed this distinction for assessing the relationship of the Pastorals to the Pauline corpus.⁵⁵ However, Donelson's study argues that, whereas Paul's style of argumentation is fairly easy to follow, understanding the order of the Pastorals necessitates comparisons to other Greco-Roman conventions especially with regard to *parae-nesis*.⁵⁶ Also drawing on non-Christian paraenetic texts, Fiore elevates one specific difference in argumentation: the use of examples. He concludes: "... an analysis of the structure of examples from the authentic Pauline letters

⁵⁴ In his 1986 monograph, Donelson describes this circumstance: "The Pastorals are composed out of an extensive array of literary forms. The arguments move from doctrinal pieces to exhortations to biographical reminiscences to virtue and vice lists to household rules. Some sections are created out of concise imperatives Other sections contain larger blocks of material This method of composition has been read by scholarship as evidence of the lack of literary design or of an inability to systematize disparate sources" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 67). Many now accept the idea that the Pastorals offer coherent arguments and themes, and are not a crazy-quilt construction; see Van Neste, *Cohesion and Structure*, 1–5 for a review of scholarship. The distinction I am making here is that, however the Pastorals are organized as individual texts (which is Van Neste's focus), their structure of argumentation differs *in the same way* from the other letters in the Pauline corpus.

⁵⁵ Donelson remarked, "It might seem that defenders of Pauline authorship would want to detect clear argumentation in the letters, but Spicq, Jeremias, Kelly, and others do not do this in commentaries In fact, very little is ever said about the literary style of the author, except perhaps to note that his mode of argumentation is lifeless compared with Paul's" (*ibid.*, 68). Scholarship on this issue is still somewhat uneven. Those who pay little passing interest to the structure of argumentation include Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, and S.C. Martin, "*Pauli Testamentum*." However, Marshall does provide a serious analysis of the structure of each Pastoral letter, and concludes that "they are constructed in a different manner from the acknowledged letters of Paul" (*Pastoral Epistles*, 12–40, here 62–63). Following Marshall, Towner briefly mentions that "... the argumentation is held to be differently constructed and accented," but denies, without further engagement of the evidence, that this signifies any important "disjunction" between the Pastorals and other Paulines (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 23–24). Yet Towner is also forced to concede that it is impossible to prove the authenticity of the Pastorals (*ibid.*, 26) and he leaves open the question of authorship, suggesting Marshall's theory of "allonymity" which he links to the "amanuensis hypothesis" (*ibid.*, 86–87). This latter is attractive to Towner because "... it explains how these three Pauline letters could be different from the remaining Pauline letters and still be Pauline" (*ibid.*, 87). It seems to me that such a statement begs for a definition of "Pauline." Furthermore, throughout his commentary, Towner names Paul as the author of the letters, without any gloss or explanation. Some who promote authenticity do not examine the differences in argumentation, including: Prior, *Paul the Letter-Writer*; Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates*, and *Letters to Timothy*; and, I think, Smith, *Timothy's Task, Paul's Prospect* (although Smith claims that his work is not dependent upon a determination of authorship, but he does not examine his text from an assumption of pseudepigraphy [*ibid.*, 3, and Conclusion]).

⁵⁶ Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy*, ch. 2; esp. his references to Aristotle on enthymemes and paradigms.

and in the Pastoral Epistles reveals sufficient differences in the presentation of the material to support the view that the Pastoral Epistles are pseudonymous.⁵⁷ It is telling that in these investigations of the style and mode of argumentation there is significant agreement that the Pastorals *as a group* are different from the other Paulines, and they are different in the same way.⁵⁸

Alongside considerations of language, style, the letters' contents must be carefully examined.⁵⁹ Here, I concentrate again on the various problems

⁵⁷ *Pastoral Epistles*, 16–18. In order to account for the distinctive argumentative style of the Pastorals those who argue for some form of authorship by Paul himself usually find recourse in two kinds of theories and combinations thereof: (1) that someone acted as an amanuensis for Paul, who might have dictated the letters or directed their composition in the background, while the person inscribing the material took more responsibility than “usual” for shaping the final output (see Prior’s description of the possibilities, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, 37–59); and (2) that a different epistolary approach was required, due to either the paraenetic (“hortatory”) character of the letters (Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 322–327; Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 31–36) or to Paul’s choice of a “mandate letter” to give instructions to his delegates. The latter term was used by Johnson in *Letters to Paul’s Delegates* (32). In his later commentary, this is changed to “the *mandata principis* (literally, ‘commandments of a rule’) letter” (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 97). Comparisons of 1 Timothy and Titus to government documents can be found in Spicq (*Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 34–37). Johnson makes much use of the idea, but his comparisons to *PTebt*. 703 have been sufficiently critiqued by Mitchell (“PTebt 703 and the Genre of 1 Timothy: The Curious Career of a Ptolemaic Papyrus in Pauline Scholarship,” *NovT* 44 [2002]: 344–370). Prior also makes use of the “different genre” idea in characterizing the Pastorals as “private letters”: “... one would expect significantly different aspects of Paul’s character to appear in his private, as contrasted with his ecclesial correspondence. This could account for some of the difference between the Pastorals and the other Paulines” (*Paul the Letter-Writer*, 53). These scholars seem to be struggling to reconcile the linguistic data with their fidelity to Pauline authorship, but hypothetical secretarial theories cannot account for other crucial differences.

Johnson expresses incredulity that a pseudepigrapher could have written the Pastorals, and attempts to complicate the case for assuming non-Pauline authorship: “If these compositions are *both* pseudonymous *and* a single literary production, then we are dealing not with a clumsy imitator, but with an artist of considerable imagination Our author, in short, is not a hack who writes the same thing over and over in three segments, but an author of considerable literary skill” (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 89). One may wholeheartedly agree with Johnson, and yet still believe that such a pseudepigrapher existed and even succeeded in his project.

⁵⁸ For instance, Marshall asserts: “To sum up: despite the lack of precision that is inevitable when handling matters of style, there should be no room for doubt that the PE are distinctive in the Pauline corpus in that the three letters share a common shape of vocabulary, style and method of argument which is somehow different from that of the other ten letters in it” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 63). Fiore places 2 Thessalonians with the Pastorals in a separate category of “hortatory literature,” remarking that “Like the Pastoral Epistles, 2 Thessalonians is considered by many not to have been written by Paul” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 18).

⁵⁹ When confronting the contents of the letters, those in favor of authenticity must also

raised by the author. In each case, the evidence shows that *gender difference*, as expressed in elements of “the good woman” *topos*, emerges as a critical organizing principle of the author’s approach. Since the ideals for women and men in the Pastorals differ significantly from those of the undisputed Paulines, the views expressed about gender serve as significant confirmation that the author was not Paul himself.

(1) *Heterodox opposition*: The Pastorals give much less specific detail about the teachings of opposition figures than the authentic Paulines, as is commonly noted, and instead depend upon much more stereotypical polemic against these opponents.⁶⁰ Six named persons specifically attacked as op-

explain how the presumed historical occasions of the letters might fit into the timelines and trips described in Acts and as known from the Paulines: when would Paul have commissioned Timothy and Titus to supervise congregations in Ephesus and Crete? As a response, Johnson claims that, since “our knowledge of Paul’s movements is anything but full,” (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 64), the problems presented by the Pastorals in this area are “of no great magnitude than those presented by Galatians, Philemon, and Philippians” (*ibid.*, 68). Johnson even believes that the Pastorals “also provide the basis for expanding our understanding of Paul’s movements in exactly the same way the other letters do” (*ibid.*). Towner furthers that objective by incorporating much information about Ephesus and Crete into his exegesis as a way to give the letters a more secure historical context (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 37–40).

Arguing for an early date for Titus, Towner questions “... how [the letter of Titus] would have functioned years after Paul or Titus, when some sort of leadership would already have been in place and instructions that are so specific would have been completely irrelevant. The church setting in the letter to Titus is completely at odds with theories of late authorship” (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 51). But is it really so difficult to imagine how the teachings in Titus would function to authorize the elders appointed by the apostolic emissary and his subsequent appointees? In fact, would not the Pauline stamp of approval bolster any leaders in the Pauline succession in Crete?

⁶⁰ Dibelius and Conzelmann summarize the situation: “Here [1Tim 1:6], as in 1:4, 7b and 6:20, one feels strongly the difference between the Pastorals and the Pauline epistles in the style of the polemic. The Pastorals almost entirely avoid describing the opponents; they only want to combat them, and indeed with the same reproaches which the popular philosopher directs at his opponent” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 21). Demonstrating that the polemic directed toward opponents exhibits many elements characteristic of philosophical attacks against sophists, Karris extends this thesis: “... the Paul of the indisputedly genuine letters aids us in our quest for information. He is not content to argue against his opponents in the abstract or in general terms, but picks up their themes and argues against them on their own terms On the other hand, when one turns to the Pastoral Epistles, one is faced with an author who only once (1Tim 4:1–5) argues against his opponents by picking up their themes and entering into theological debate with them” (“The Background and Significance of the Polemic,” 549; cf. his “The Function and Sitz-im-Leben of the Paraenetic Elements in the Pastoral Epistles” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1971), 3–39. Marshall agrees with the characterization that “... the writer [of the Pastorals] refrains from a direct confrontation with

posing Paul in some way are men.⁶¹ Other opponents might possibly be male: (1) they are referred to by masculine adjectives and participles (e.g., 1 Tim 1:6–7; 4:1–3; 2 Tim 3:1–6; Titus 1:10–11); and (2) the author sets up Timothy, Titus, and “faithful men” (2 Tim 2:2) as the ecclesial counterparts to these rivals.

If men are the primary designated adversaries, women appear in a secondary role related to unsound teaching, as is especially noted: “For among these men are those who enter houses and capture frivolous women who

the teaching of his opponents,” and that “The writer is endeavoring to combat the heresy not by engaging in refutation of its views but by simply dismissing it as trivial and unimportant” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 41 and 42). However, Marshall finds some specificity in the opponents’ teachings (ibid., 44–46), yet does not make further comparisons with the Paulines on this point. See also Fiore, *Pastoral Epistles*, 14–15. Even Johnson, who claims that 1 Timothy uses “substantial theological refutation at least four times,” allows that “What is distinctive to the Pastorals [compared with the other Paulines] is the amount of polemical material they employ, its stereotypical character, and, above all, its literary function in 1 and 2 Timothy” (*Letters to Paul’s Delegates*, 13; reiterated in *Letters to Timothy*, 73). Johnson concludes that the distinctiveness may be accounted for in the “literary form” of the letters: they are “private” and addressed to Paul’s delegates (ibid., 94–97). Explaining the literary function of the polemic, he states that it consists in making a contrast between good and bad teachers (ibid., 245), although at first he does not clarify to whom and for what reason such a contrast would be important: to Timothy, so that he would recognize his own “goodness”? To the believers in Timothy’s assembly, so that they could discern who to follow? Later, Johnson asserts that the attacks on the opponents, especially in 2 Timothy, are meant to encourage Timothy (ibid., 320), and that Paul uses “the disparagement of opposing teachers in order to recommend [his] own teaching as superior” (ibid., 323). Then, too, “the false teachers become the negative model that Timothy is to avoid” (ibid.). Johnson delves further into methods of philosophical teaching with Timothy in the learner’s role (ibid., 324–329). Smith appears to follow this line of reasoning: “Paul does this to demarcate clearly the true Christian minister (i.e. Paul) from the dilettante (i.e. false teachers) so that Timothy will see the qualitative difference between them and thereby have a preference for Paul’s paradigm” (*Timothy’s Task*, 190; parenthetical comments are original). This position is also taken by Towner (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 105), although he expands the epistolary audience when he says that 1 Tim 4:1–5 and 6:3–10 are “designed mainly to identify (*for all*) and denounce the beliefs and practices of the false teachers. Even in these sections, Timothy remains in view as the one who would see that the refutation of the opponents was carried out on the basis of Paul’s denunciation ...” (ibid., 286; *my italics*).

⁶¹ Hymenaeus and Alexander, 1 Tim 1:20; Phygelus and Hermogenes, 2 Tim 1:15; Hymenaeus and Philetus, 2 Tim 2:17; Demas, 2 Tim 4:9 (who is close to Paul in Philemon 24; also Col 4:14); Alexander, 2 Tim 4:14. The rhetorical strategy of identifying opponents by name is not used in the authentic Pauline letters, nor in Ephesians and Colossians, in which “Paul” seems completely intent upon encouraging others, on recommending his co-workers, and on creating warm epistolary relationships through his greetings. The most sustained polemics against others occur in 2 Corinthians 10–13 where not a single adversary is named. The only exceptions might be Cephas and Barnabas, whom Paul criticizes (Gal 2:11–14). Euodia and Syntyche are “entreated” (Phil 4:2), but clearly do not contend with Paul.

are loaded up with sins, being led by various desires" (2 Tim 3:6).⁶² Within the larger Pauline corpus, this perception of men as active opponents of Paul along with the view of women as vulnerable to deception is distinctive to the author of the Pastorals. For instance, he claims in 1 Tim 2:13–14: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being thoroughly deceived, has been in transgression." Such is this author's gender-differentiated interpretation of Genesis 1–3, which contrasts with Paul's explanation of the Fall in Rom 5:12–21, as well as with his analogy of the whole church to Eve in 2 Cor 11:2.⁶³

Furthermore, the teachings of the opponents are derided repeatedly as being founded on speculation and myths (1 Tim 1:4; 2 Tim 4:4; Titus 1:14), and these too are associated with women when the author warns Timothy: "refuse profane and old womanly myths!" (1 Tim 4:7). The author uses a stereotype in order to jab at the male opponents: by calling their views "old womanly," he disparages them as both senile and effeminate.

(2) *Asceticism/marriage*: While Paul promoted remaining unmarried for both men and women at several points in 1 Corinthians 7,⁶⁴ the Pastorals proscribe this practice as heretical, placing it in the mouths of "liars" (ψευ-

⁶² My translation choices for this verse and others from the Pastorals are provided in Appendix B. Gerd Häfner remarks: "Aus der Präsentation in 2 Tim ergibt sich kein Hinweis, warum die bekämpfte Lehre gerade für Frauen attraktiv gewesen ist. Diese Lücke lässt sich erst durch den Blick auf die beiden anderen Briefen füllen. Dabei zeigt sich nämlich, dass die Gegner eine Frauenrolle vertreten, die der Sicht des Verfassers zuwiderläuft: nicht ausgerichtet auf die Pflichterfüllung in Haus und Familie ..." ("Das Corpus Pastorale als literarisches Konstrukt," *TQ* 187, 4 [2007]: 269–270). Some younger widows have evidently moved in a similar direction: "for already some [younger widows] have turned away after Satan" (1 Tim 5:15). The men who "enter houses" and captivate women are like the *hetairai* who are out hunting for men in *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Nikostrate*. The similarity exists in that neither the men in 2 Timothy 3 nor the *hetairai* take up the appropriate domestic roles: they do not remain "in their places."

⁶³ The example of Eve is investigated much further in Chapter Six.

⁶⁴ Vv. 7–9, 25–35, 38, 39–40. Of course, Paul also expects marital faithfulness in this chapter while recognizing that it might just be possible for someone to divorce an unbelieving spouse. In 1 Thess 4:3–8, an admittedly difficult section, Paul exhorts Thessalonians to avoid *porneia*, and to "acquire one's own vessel in holiness and honor" (τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος ἁγιασθῆναι ἐν ἀγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, 4:4). In my opinion, the most likely interpretation of this contested phrase is that Paul is affirming marriage and marital fidelity. Whether this instruction is addressed to men only is another vexed question. Richard S. Ascough offers the unusual perception that the Thessalonian community was primarily male (*Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philipians & 1 Thessalonians* [WUNT II 161; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003]). This seems unlikely given the ubiquitous presence of women in the Pauline communities as known through Acts and the letters.

δολόγοι, 1 Tim 4:1–5). Instead, the Pastorals prefer the married state for both sexes (with the exception, perhaps, of older widows), and both husbands and wives are urged to maintain marital fidelity to their spouse.⁶⁵ However, such evenhandedness ought not to obscure the fact that in the Pastorals women are the targets of a specific instruction to get married, while men receive no explicit teaching (1 Tim 5:14; cf. Titus 2:4–5).

The woman-only teachings in the Pastorals are to be distinguished from the instructions in 1 Corinthians 7, where Paul addresses the situations of men and women in an intertwining fashion. The historical Paul gives more consideration to special circumstances, as when a believer is married to an unbeliever.⁶⁶ Although the Pastorals' author perceives that some female believers are acting in ways with which he disagrees, inscriptional and other evidence from the Roman world indicates that most women and most men would likely have affirmed the conventional sex-differentiated ideology contained in his letters.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ 1 Tim 3:2, 11, 12; 5:9; Titus 1:6; 2:4. There is no possibility for divorce recognized here.

⁶⁶ Even in the "household codes" of the deutero-Paulines Colossians and Ephesians, there are different ideological proofs given and vocabulary used that distinguish these teachings from those found in the Pastorals. Advice on marriage is given both spouses: Colossians 3 briefly names both wives and husbands, while Ephesians 5 offers one verse for wives (5:22) followed by a long section for husbands (5:23–33; cf. also, 1 Peter 3).

Klaus Berger's chart seems to indicate a distinction between the relevant passages in Eph-Col and in the Pastorals, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," *ANRW* II.25.2 (1984), 1080. He singles out 1 Pet 3:1–6; 1 Tim 2:9–15; and Titus 2:3–5 as "vergleichbare neutestamentliche Texte" to a range of Hellenistic paraenetic literature, including the Pythagorean women's letters ("Hellenistische Gattungen," 1082). See also Wagener's discussion and critique of Berger's attempt to delineate a genre for the Haustafeln (*Die Ordnung*, 54–61). Wagener points out Berger's "Mangel an Präzision in der Gattungsabgrenzung," in dealing with New Testament material on the household (*ibid.*, 56).

⁶⁷ Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald postulate that early Christian women might have responded positively to Pauline statements about marriage: "Already accustomed to the rhetoric of submission, such women might have seen in Eph. 5:21–33, which likens wife and husband to the church and Christ, a bestowal of new identity. Already used to bearing the symbolic weight of house, family, chastity, and the honor of family and city-state, they may have been filled with an appropriate sense of their own importance as representatives of the church itself ..." (*A Woman's Place*, 15). This supposition is not necessarily a happy one for feminist interpreters, who might prefer that early Christian "women" found in various Christian theology and practices are shown as standing up for their rights, asserting their equality with men, and finding release from the stifling burden of domestic duties. This opinion has been popular in the U.S. since the 1970s and 80s, and reviewed by Corley (*Women and the Historical Jesus*, esp. Introduction and ch. 1). See also the reasoned summary of the evidence in Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place*, 1–6.

(3) *Church leadership*.⁶⁸ Commentators often examine the issue of church leadership at the same time as that of church organization, and of course the two are literally connected. Still, considering leadership roles separately serves to emphasize the author's view that one's gender is crucial to one's activities in the church. The Pastorals give much advice on church offices, and those who point out that 2 Timothy contains less of this material must still acknowledge that this letter conveys a consistent interest in and view of leadership: the approved teaching and speaking roles are only open to men.⁶⁹ None of the undisputed Paulines explicitly restrict women from church offices, or even suggest a gender preference for these roles (Rom 12:1–8; 1 Cor 12:4–13, 28–30; Phil 4:2–3; and 1 Thess 5:12–13; cf. Eph 4:7–12). Admittedly there is the mixed message found in 1 Corinthians, where Paul first prescribes proper head-covering for female prophets, yet still allows women to pray and prophesy (1 Cor 11:3–16). A few chapters later, in a possibly interpolated section, women are enjoined to remain silent in the churches (1 Cor 14:34–35). However, in the lengthy discussion of prophecy and tongues in 1 Cor 14, women and men are never addressed separately.⁷⁰ Furthermore,

⁶⁸ It is widely agreed that the Pastorals seem to demonstrate much more “interest in and complexity of church leadership roles” (Bassler, *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*, 18), including the laying on of hands, leadership qualifications, and church discipline. Supporters of Pauline authorship claim that this focus has been overstated, since (only?) “approximately one sixth of the letters is taken up with church order in the strict sense ...” (Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 52). This concentration is said to be limited to 1 Timothy and Titus: “2 Timothy does not take up the matter” (Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 50). However, even the context envisioned by 2 Timothy still presumes a more developed situation of leadership appointment and authorization (2 Tim 1:6, 13–14; 3:10–17). The question then becomes how long such a process of institutional structuring would have taken. Johnson compares the Pastorals’ church organization with that found in the letters of Ignatius, who advocates “a monarchical episcopate and hierarchical order,” and finds that the Pastorals are lacking such teachings for leadership (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 74–75). For Johnson, although this does not prove Pauline authorship, it does suggest an earlier dating for the Pastorals, since “nothing in these compositions is anachronistic for church organization in Paul’s time ...” (ibid., 7). But, as I argue here, the Pastorals do exhibit anachronisms regarding structures, a crucial one of which is the change in women’s leadership roles.

⁶⁹ This direct command for “Timothy” is relevant: “hand over these things to faithful men, who will be able also to teach others,” ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι, 2 Tim 2:2. The imperatives in 2 Tim 4:2, 5 also indicate the kinds of tasks taken up by community leaders: “proclaim the word, be ready in season or out of season, reprove, censure, exhort, with all patience and teaching ... but you should be sober in all things, bear suffering, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your service” κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον, ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδασχῇ σὺ δὲ νῆφε ἐν πάσιν, κακοπάθησον, ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον.

⁷⁰ None of the other issues that seem to have led to factionalism in the Corinthian ἐκκλησία are blamed on one sex as opposed to the other. Paul handles such topics as the

Paul highlights women in leadership capacities: Phoebe (Rom 16:1–2), Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:2–3), Apphia (Philemon 2), Prisca (and Aquila; Rom 16:3–5; 1 Cor 16:19), and Junia (and Andronicus; Rom 16:7).⁷¹

(4) *Church order*: In the Pastorals, the overarching image of the assembly becomes “the household of God” (1 Tim 3:14–15).⁷² Of course, the historical Paul uses the language of household relationships, and he is the “father” of the believers and of each community he founded (e.g., 1 Thess 2:11; 1 Cor 4:15; Philemon 10) or even their nurse/nursing mother (1 Thess 2:7–8; 1 Cor 3:2), but the believers are usually siblings of Paul and each other,⁷³ under the fatherhood of God (e.g., Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6). Other familial relations are drawn upon by Paul. The entire Corinthian community (or perhaps all of Paul’s assemblies collectively?) is likened to the bride of Christ (2 Cor 11:2–3; cf. Eph 5:32). The Galatian believers together are called children (τέκνα) of the free woman (4:21–31). However, one may accurately conclude with Jorunn Økland that Paul is “never absorbed by the household discourse even if he *partly* draws on the same discourse as other NT authors of domestic codes, as shown in numerous comparisons between 1 Cor 14:33b–37 and 1 Tim 2:11–13a.”⁷⁴

By the time of the Pastorals, each person’s role in their literal household corresponds to their role in the ἐκκλησία, so that fathers and mothers fulfill similar functions in the church (e.g., 1 Tim 3:4–5, 12, 5:1–2, 9–10). Younger people are called to remember their youthful inexperience and to respect their seniors (1 Tim 3:4–5, 12; 5:1–2, 3–8, 17–19; 2 Tim 2:22–24; Titus 1:5–6; 2:6–8, 15). Simultaneously, the author encourages women to take on the three feminine household roles of wife, mother, and household manager (1 Tim 2:15; 5:9–10, 14; Titus 2:3–5; cf. also 2 Tim 1:5, where Lois and Eunice

following without referring to gender: baptism, spiritual status-seeking, lawsuits, food offered to idols, practices of the Lord’s supper, spiritual gifts, love, the resurrection of the body (surely this topic lent itself to some gender-differentiated comments as Paul thought about human bodies), and the collection for the saints. Besides the passages about women’s speech-acts in the assembly, only the discussion of the man living with his father’s wife (1 Cor 5:1–5) and the image of a man joining with a prostitute (6:15–18) (necessarily) raise the notion of gender.

⁷¹ Cf. also “Nympe and the assembly in her house,” Col 4:15.

⁷² This concept may be related to Eph 2:19, where believers are called “members of the household of God” (οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ). Verner argues that these verses provide the general purpose for writing 1 Timothy (*The Household of God*, 107–111).

⁷³ E.g., 1 Thess 2:1, 9, 17; 3:7; 4:1, 9, 10, 13; 5:1, 12, 14, 25, 26, 27; Rom 7:11; 12:1; 14:10; 1 Cor 1:10; 6:1–6; 10:1; 12:1; 15:1; 16:20, and so forth.

⁷⁴ *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space* (JSNTSS 269; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 203.

are valorized as mothers).⁷⁵ This is a step that Paul never takes; instead, he recognizes women in other roles: Phoebe as διάκονος and προστάτις (Rom 16:1–2); Prisca as συνεργός (Rom 16:3); and Junia as ἀπόστολος (Rom 16:7).

In 1Tim 2:15, a surprising theological justification accompanies motherhood: “she will be saved through childbearing” (σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας), a logic contrary to the classic statements of Pauline justification by faith, not by works of the law (Gal 2:16; Rom 3:28) and particularly Rom 10:9: “if you profess with your mouth Jesus is lord, and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you *will be saved*.”⁷⁶ The theology of 1Timothy also runs counter to Paul’s view of the value of the unmarried state: “And the unmarried woman or the virgin cares for the things of the Lord, so that she might be holy (ἅγιος) both in body and in soul; but the married woman cares for the things of the world, how she might please her husband.”⁷⁷ In point of fact, the Pastorals link women’s “holiness” directly to their proper implementation of these household duties: they should be “loving of husbands, loving of children, *sōphrōn*, pure (ἁγός), good house-workers, subordinated to their own husbands” (Titus 2:4–5). It is truly difficult to imagine such assertions as 1Tim 2:15, 5:14, and Titus 2:4–5 coming from the hand of Paul, yet they are wholly consistent with the gendered worldview of the Pastorals, whose author has repeatedly appropriated elements of the moral-philosophical *topos* of “the good woman.”

(5) *Wealth*: The Paulines convey information about offering for the Jerusalem saints (Rom 15:25–28; 1Cor 16:1–4; 2Cor 8, 9), and the apostle teaches about wealth and especially about generous giving using many theological and spiritual justifications (Rom 9:23; 10:12; 11:12; 1Cor 1:5; 4:8; 2Cor 6:10; 8:9; 9:11; Phil 4:19). However, the Pastorals make no reference whatsoever to the collection, which is particularly odd given Titus’ responsibilities regarding its delivery (2Cor 8:16–24). While the author also reflects theologically on wealth (1Tim 6:18; Titus 3:6), he deals with the use of wealth differently from the other Pauline letters. Whereas Paul focuses on the “equalization of riches” among the assemblies (2Cor 8:13–15), the Pastorals take a more

⁷⁵ I discuss further the overlapping of women’s roles in household and house church, in particular the issue of “offices” of female deacons (1Tim 3:11) and widows (1Tim 5:3–16), in Chapters 7 and 8.

⁷⁶ ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἡγείρειν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ.

⁷⁷ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἁγία καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡ ἁγία καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρί, 1Cor 7:34.

individualistic approach to rich persons, and link their generosity to “good works” and to the obtaining of eternal life (1 Tim 6:9–10, 17).⁷⁸ Even these concerns about money have a gendered bias to them, as the author directs severe criticism at an unspecified widow: “the one who is living luxuriously, although she lives has died” (1 Tim 5:6). Similarly, he proscribes the wearing of “gold or pearls or expensive clothing” by women (1 Tim 2:9).

(6) *Community reputation*: In the undisputed letters, Paul considers the assemblies’ relationship with non-believers, and there his advice is to give no offense to those outside (1 Cor 10:23–30; 14:20–25; 1 Thess 4:11–12; cf. Col 4:5–6).⁷⁹ Similarly, the Pastorals are concerned about the reputation of the assemblies, but potential problems are to be resolved by community members behaving in a manner appropriate to their social and household positions (1 Tim 3:7; Titus 2:5, 8, 10; cf. Titus 1:6; 3:2). One significant distinction is that while Paul’s teachings appear to deal with the assembly as a whole, the Pastorals’ instructions divide the community into components partly based on gender.

Over and over again, as the author of the Pastorals equates Christian ethics with socially proper behavior for different groups of people, he articulates theological, practical, and moral differences based on gender. Furthermore, each of the major issues identified in the Pastorals bears the stamp of the author’s gendered worldview. As a result, his epistolary project diverges from that of the undisputed Paulines. While Paul occasionally comments on physical and thus behavioral distinctions between men and women,⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Reggie M. Kidd states that, according to this author, “Those who long to use their wealth in the service of others and who will promote sound doctrine aspire to a noble work,” *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A “Bourgeois” Form of Early Christianity?* (SBLDS 122; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 97, also his conclusions, 108–109, and 126–129.

⁷⁹ In 1 Corinthians, Paul does not explicitly say that the practice of allowing women to pray and prophesy brings the assembly into disrepute, although he does think that cross-gendered head coverings (hairstyles?) is dishonoring (κατασχύνειν) to both women and men (1 Cor 11:4–7; cf. also vv. 13–14).

⁸⁰ The clearest statements arise in 1 Cor 11:3–16, but even here Paul takes some pains to acknowledge the interdependence of men and women: “However, neither woman apart from man, nor man apart from woman; for since the woman is from the man, thus also the man is through the woman, and all things are from God,” πλὴν οὕτε γυνὴ χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς οὕτε ἀνὴρ χωρὶς γυναικὸς ἐν κυρίῳ· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικὸς· τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. While the Pastorals offer some parallel teachings for men and women, these serve to separate the sexes into different household “compartments,” rather than to acknowledge the mutuality of male and female. As another example, even *Theano to Nikostrate* puts forward the essential benefit of marriage for *both* spouses in a manner that suggests more complementarity than the images found in the Pastorals.

his logic does not rely on these gender differences nearly as much, nor does he foresee gender-specific ways of salvation. This apostle even expressed a vision of a baptized community existing as a unity not based on conventional social divisions: “There is not Jew nor Greek, there is not slave nor free, there is not male and female, for you all are one in Christ Jesus.”⁸¹

All this is not to say that Paul would necessarily disagree with the Pastorals’ views of gender differentiation, and especially that leadership in family, assembly, and society ought to be reserved for men. Setting aside Phoebe, Prisca, and several other named women (e.g., Euodia and Syntyche), Paul’s closest associates all seem to be men. Timothy and Titus are especially prominent, and Paul names more men than women in his greetings.⁸² There is also the matter of the male-female hierarchy prescribed in 1 Cor 11:3–16 and 1 Cor 14:34–35, and, whatever one thinks about the authenticity of the latter, the former is surely the apostle’s own opinion.⁸³ It may be an intentional choice on Paul’s part to avoid arguing based on gender differences, and perhaps this was related to the situations in the communities to which he wrote; yet still, it is true that he only rarely utilized elements of the *topos* of “the good woman” in his instructions. The result is that whereas sex-based distinctions do not loom large in the rest of the Pauline corpus, the gendered perspective articulated in all three Pastorals is conspicuous,⁸⁴ pointing toward a common author who was not Paul himself.

In sum, the internal evidence provides ample substantiation for reading the Pastorals *as a coherent corpus*: they exhibit similar linguistic characteristics and structure of argumentation, combined with the conviction that socially-conventional gender differences are significant and even crucial to the faithful lives of believers in their house churches. When these epistolary commonalities are evaluated along with the text history and early attesta-

⁸¹ οὐκ ἐνι Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἑλλήνι, οὐκ ἐνι δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ, οὐκ ἐνι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυν πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Gal 3:28.

⁸² Of course, throughout the Pauline corpus (and the NT), Greek plural masculine nouns and adjectives obscure the presence or absence of women.

⁸³ Regarding the connection between 1 Cor 14:34–35 and 1 Tim 2:11–12, Økland sagely observes “It could mean that both Paul and the author of 1 Timothy are shaped by a broader pagan and/or Jewish discourse with quite precise notions about women’s roles in a certain type of ritual setting” (*Women in Their Place*, 203).

⁸⁴ When the Pastorals instruct women *qua* women they also stand in contrast to most other first- and second-century Christian authors. Marshall observes that while 1 Clement 1 and 21 exhort women to silence, “For the rest of the AF there is total silence about any teaching or speaking role of women in the church, and for Ignatius women scarcely exist. Only in Hermas does an aged woman play a significant part as the transmitter of revelation” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 57).

tions, there can be no doubt that the three letters agree with each other on critical points, while at the same time differing significantly from the earlier Pauline letters.⁸⁵ My project proceeds from this conclusion: that the Pastorals are pseudepigraphic productions from the hand of a single author, who lived in the post-Pauline era.

The dating of the Pastorals is highly contested, with a range from the last third of the first century to much later in the second century CE.⁸⁶ Obviously the presumption of pseudonymity means that enough time must be allowed for a particular form of a fairly well-known and well-used Pauline collection (whether four letters of Paul's own edition, or letters to seven churches, or in some other embodiment) to have found its way into the hands of the author of the Pastorals. A date around 100 CE falls toward the middle of the range, and takes into account an increased circulation of the larger Pauline corpus after Paul's death, while also allowing time for the Pastorals to be attached to the collection in order to be available to Polycarp and *1 Clement* (and perhaps Ignatius). The general time period puts the Pastorals into the same historical

⁸⁵ Among many others, Häfner decides: "Die dargestellte Häufung von Charakteristika sprachlicher und inhaltlicher Art erweist die Sonderstellung der Past im *Corpus Paulinum*. Zwischen ihnen muss ein Zusammenhang bestehen, der sie absetzt von den übrigen Briefen, die unter dem Namen des Paulus geschrieben wurden" ("Das Corpus Pastorale," 269).

⁸⁶ Goodspeed places them after the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp, "in the second quarter of the second century" (*New Solutions*, 39); followed by Barnett (*Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941], 170–185, 251). Viewing the Pastorals as "pre-texts" for the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp, Merz decides for an earlier date: "Da sie in Antiochia in Syrien, Smyrna und Ephesus in Kleinasien und vermutlich Philippippi in Makedonien zwischen 110–120 n.Chr. zu den Paulusbrieffen zählen, sind sie kaum nach der Jahrhundertwende entstanden" (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 188). Wagener allows the broad range of 90–150 CE, but leans toward the second half of this period (*Die Ordnung*, 13–14). On the other hand, Quinn opts for an earlier date, saying "The years from about 70–100 CE offer a time frame that allows for post-Pauline ecclesial developments as well as some linkage with the Paul of history and his apostolate This commentary favors 80–85 for the letters as we have them" (*Letter to Titus*, 18–19). Fiore likewise dates the Pastorals to the late first century because of their portrayal of "the position of Timothy and Titus as apostolic delegates over local church communities ..." (*Pastoral Epistles*, 19). Marshall believes the church leadership structures depicted in the Pastorals are somewhat more developed than in Paul's time, but not systematized enough to push the dating of the letters to after 100 CE, and sets them in the years just after 70 CE (*Pastoral Epistles*, 53–54, 57).

Naturally, those scholars who accept that Paul authored one or more of the Pastorals must move the date even earlier into the lifetime of Paul, as, for example, Johnson claims: "they should ... be read in the context of Paul's ministry between the years 49–68 C.E." (*Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 2). Towner never states a specific date, but rather says that the letters represent a transition from the first to the second generation of Christian leaders, and that some of the differences in style can be accounted for by adopting the "amanuensis hypothesis" (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 84, 86–87).

context as the Pythagorean women's letters, also gathered into the popular textual form of an epistolary collection.

Yet the precise date of composition is not as important for my argument as the fact of pseudepigraphy itself, and the author's purpose of composing such letters as teaching texts. That is to say, the Pastorals have been and may continue to be read as a *collection of textual resources*, providing what the author thinks of as Pauline teachings for his Christian audience. This means that the author's instructions about women in the separate letters remain congruent across all three letters; even more, the teachings are *intra-textual* in the sense that they reference, reiterate, and authorize each other. At the same time, with at least one eye turned toward the prior Pauline collection(s), the author seeks to draw upon those letters, explaining them more clearly, and correcting what he thinks of as wrong interpretations of Paul's teachings for women. By means of these intentional correlations with the larger Pauline collection, the Pastorals collection is also *inter-textual*.⁸⁷

READING STRATEGIES FOR LETTER COLLECTIONS

Because the Pastorals are found in the composite form of a letter collection, certain interpretive steps may be applied, as already described with reference to the Pythagorean letters. First of all, because of the famous pseudonyms used for sender and recipients, the Pastorals were eventually preserved within the sub-collection of Pauline letters written to individuals. When the Pastorals are read in that smaller collection, and then read alongside the larger Pauline corpus, the process of authorizing the texts is that the Pastorals *receive authority from* and at the same time *supplement the authority of* the other Pauline letters. As Goodspeed affirms: "In all this literary movement [of the Christian collecting of gospels and letters] we must distinguish the influence of a given letter or gospel, by itself, *from the influence of the same document gathered into a collection and buttressed by a mass of kindred documents*."⁸⁸ The eventual acceptance of the Pastorals as

⁸⁷ It is, of course, a major contribution of Merz's work to promote this direction in the study of the pseudo-Paulines.

⁸⁸ *New Solutions*, 48; my italics. He continues, "And if the overwhelming majority of the early Christian literature that followed the publication of Paul's collected letters was written in the presence and more or less under the influence of the collection, then it follows that *they can be successfully interpreted only in the light of that fact*" (ibid., my italics). Goodspeed's use of the term "mass" connotes how collected letters accumulate a certain literal "bulk," growing in the number of actual pages.

genuinely Pauline signaled the successful outcome of the author's use of a famous pseudonym: his letters have acquired the authority extended to the entire collection. Furthermore, for many centuries, the Pastorals have lent their own authorial influence to the other Pauline letters, by expanding the collection in number, as well as by attempting to explain and correct Paul's teachings.

In particular, one prominent question the Pastorals appear to address is: "what does Paul teach about women?" The avid student of all the Paulines—one who follows Quintilian's advice, and reads the letters *seriatim*, then re-reads them, and finally, gives the texts "frequent re-readings"—now finds many treatments of this topic in the entire letter-collection, some of which seem to be ambiguous and even contradictory. In fact, the author of the Pastorals intended his instructions for and about women in the household of God to be the interpretive key to definitive Pauline teaching on the subject, and, to a large extent, and for a long time, his purpose was achieved.

Rosenmeyer's assertion that there is a logic to the arrangement of letters in a collection leads first to a consideration of the eventual canonical sequence of the Pastorals, which seems to be based on the practical criterion of length, from longest to shortest. At the most basic level, if the letters are read sequentially, then the meaning of each is dependent upon the letter that precedes it, so that, for example, the teachings referring to women would then build one layer upon another in a seamless edifice. Then, of course, re-reading these teachings in the Pastorals and correlating them with the rest of the Pauline collection provides more data for the reader to use in understanding "Paul's view of women." To my knowledge, no earlier scholarship examines how such inclusive readings might influence one's interpretation of particular teachings for and about women in the Pastorals.⁸⁹

We do not know the original order of the Pastorals, and they may very well have never circulated apart from other Paulines, so that Rosenmeyer's reading strategy cannot be unquestionably applied to the Pastorals alone. However, the author must certainly have composed the letters in a chronological sequence, and with some sort of plan in mind.⁹⁰ Recently, two different

⁸⁹ Wagener has drawn connections between teachings for and about women within 1 Timothy, while Merz has most competently treated the intertextuality of the 1 Tim 2:9–3:11a with other Pauline teachings.

⁹⁰ The creativity and intelligence of this author has been marveled at by scholars and viewed as an argument for their authenticity; see my quote from Johnson, n. 57 above. However, since it has long been noted that, in contrast to Paul, the author writes in a more

“original” arrangements of the Pastoral letters have been suggested which I draw upon here in order to expand the theory of reading letters in collections.⁹¹

Quinn concludes that the original order of the Pastorals was Titus – 1 Timothy – 2 (Timothy, as attested by the Muratorian Fragment and Ambrosiaster.⁹² As the opening letter, Titus could then be read as “programmatically” for 1 and 2 Timothy.⁹³ Looking just at the teachings about women, the pithy instructions in Titus 2:3–5 would then establish the general parameters of moral training for women in the author’s assemblies, providing the lens through which to view the various teachings to and about women in the other two letters, but especially in 1 Timothy. Within the Pastorals’ sub-collection, “Paul’s” command to Titus to establish the older women as virtuous teachers of the younger women is wholly consistent with the other

sophisticated Greek and betrays more interest in popular philosophical thought, we could reasonably assume that he possessed a different (rather than “better”?) education than Paul. These skills combined with the author’s ability to read and to incorporate Pauline teachings, as well as the incredible usefulness what he wrote, are what allowed his letters to pass as authentic, unlike more easily detected pseudepigrapha, e.g., *3 Corinthians*.

⁹¹ The issue of the original sequence of the Pastorals is of little concern to those who claim Pauline authenticity for them, since then the Pastorals are “three *separate* letters” (Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 14), possessing “historical and literary individuality” (Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 1). Johnson argues strongly: “Each letter addresses a particular situation, has its own literary form, and uses its own mode of argumentation. Each letter must therefore be considered individually and in particular rather than in general and as part of a larger group” (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 98). However, he does state that “the Pauline corpus is assumed to be the appropriate comparative context for each letter” (*ibid.*). For Johnson, the Pastorals’ contents may be cross-referenced with all the other Paulines, but not treated within their own smaller corpus. Obviously, I disagree with Herzer, who avers: “Die drei Pastoralbriefe müssen stärker von ihrem eigenen Profil und Anspruch her interpretiert werden” (“Abschied vom Konsens?”, 1281).

⁹² *Letter to Titus*, 3. The priority of Titus is also suggested by the much longer opening in Titus 1:1–4, which might explain the more abbreviated prescript form in 1 Timothy: “The elaborate, sixty-six-word epistolary prologue of Titus 1:1–4 sounds like the preface to the collection, not only to the short letter that follows. At the same time, 1 and 2 Tim complement each other, and a final position for the epistolary testament of 2 Tim is evidently appropriate ...” (*ibid.*, 19–20).

⁹³ I am intrigued, but not convinced, by Quinn’s assessment of this ordering of the letters, which he sees as fulfilling an earlier statement of Paul’s: “The house churches envisioned by Titus take first place in this collection not because they are small and relatively isolated but because they are predominantly Jewish-Christian. The Pauline proclamation of the gospel in the previous generation had been ‘to everyone who believes’; but that universal proclamation involved a divinely willed priority, ‘to the Jew first, and also to the Greek’ (Rom 1:16 [RSV] ...). The PE preserve this priority in the positioning of Titus before 1 Tim (where the house churches appear to be predominantly of pagan origin and Paul is explicitly ‘the Gentiles’ teacher’ [1 Tim 2:7])” (*Letter to Titus*, 20).

instructions for women.⁹⁴ Moreover, given the opportunity to re-read and cross-reference *all* the canonical Pauline letters, this same lens from Titus 2 could be focused on the instructions for women throughout the entire Pauline collection. As one important example, Titus 2:3–5 would “clarify” Paul’s teachings in 1 Cor 7:7–8, 25–28, 38b, 40, where he advocates abstinence from marriage, by reinforcing the expectation there (1 Cor 7:2–5, 10–16; 38a, 39) that women should marry, and also love their husbands and children.

The second suggestion comes from Häfner, who finds literary,⁹⁵ geographical,⁹⁶ and chronological⁹⁷ evidence for the sequence 1 Tim – Titus – 2 Tim. The teachings about the opponents and women in 1 Timothy thus influence one’s interpretation of the second chapter of Titus: “Leser, die von 1 Tim herkommen, sind in dieser Frage eindeutig im Vorteil. Sie wissen: Die Gegner vertreten eine Frauenrolle, die gerade nicht ausgerichtet ist auf die Erfüllung der Pflichten in Haus und Familie (1 Tim 4:3).”⁹⁸ Because “Paul” has already given such instructions to women in 1 Timothy (2:15; 5:14), and has determined that some younger widows deviated from the ideal (5:15), the “healthy teaching” provided in Titus 2:3–5 is written to provide a contrast to the teaching emanating from the opposition.⁹⁹

What of the placement of 2 Timothy at the end of Häfner’s sequence? Then it matters very little that, as some scholars note, 2 Timothy does not as often speak of women (or persons in other household groupings). Instead, the proposed position of 2 Timothy at the close of the collection, as well as the elements characteristic of testamentary literature that differentiate it from Titus and 1 Timothy,¹⁰⁰ might lead to the perception that it serves as

⁹⁴ This idea would then be reiterated in the references to the groups of older and younger widows in 1 Tim 5:9–15.

⁹⁵ Häfner observes that 1 Timothy lacks typical epistolary closing elements which would not be necessary for the first letter in a collection, and that are subsequently supplied in 2 Timothy (“Das Corpus Pastorale,” 270–271). He finds another literary element in the names Hymenaeus and Alexander, which inscribe “ein Bogen vom Beginn des 1. Bis zum Ende des 2. Timotheusbriefs” (ibid., 271).

⁹⁶ This principle sees Paul travelling generally west to east: from Ephesus to Macedonia in 1 Tim, staying in Nicopolis in Titus, writing 2 Tim from Rome (ibid., 272).

⁹⁷ This claim is based on references to “winter” in Titus 3:12 and 2 Tim 4:21 (ibid., 273).

⁹⁸ Ibid., 270.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ The different epistolary character of 2 Timothy is analyzed by Prior, *Paul the Letter-Writer*; S.C. Martin, “*Pauli Testamentum*”; Smith, *Timothy’s Task, Paul’s Prospect*; more briefly, Johnson, *Letters to Paul’s Delegates*, 37–41, and *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 91–97; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 12, 39–40, 85–87; Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 79–83; Fiore, *Pastoral Epistles*, 8–9.

the final Pauline stamp of approval on all the teachings contained in the two Pastorals that precede it. Interestingly, in the Muratorian Fragment the letter of 2 Timothy closes the smaller “letters to individuals” corpus,¹⁰¹ and is thus in the ultimate position for the entire Pauline collection. Its particular location in relation to the Pastorals and the other Paulines would then serve to empower Timothy as Paul’s approved subordinate, and to validate the Pastorals’ “correction” of all the teachings for women that precede it.

Even if 2 Timothy cannot reliably be positioned as the originally last member of the Pastorals, or the last of all the Paulines, its epistolary contents makes it “last” in a temporal sense.¹⁰² What more fitting way to authorize all the Pauline letters than by this letter from an elderly Paul, near the end of his apostolic run, written to his most trusted subordinate? Timothy is the one to whom the Pauline *παράθήκη* has been entrusted (2 Tim 1:12, 14), and who in turn will “hand over these things to faithful men, who will be able also to teach others” (2 Tim 2:2b–c). In his earliest letters, Paul was indubitably in charge, but Timothy’s prominent teaching role was already prefigured:

For you may have myriad custodians in Christ, but you do not have many fathers, for in Christ I begat you through the gospel. Therefore, I urge you, become imitators of me. For this reason I sent Timothy to you, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, who will remind you of my ways in Christ Jesus, just as I teach everywhere in every *ekklēsia*.¹⁰³

The testimony of 2 Timothy reinforces such statements from Paul: whatever Timothy teaches may be trusted, because Paul himself has taught and trusted him. For the present argument, this means that the instructions for women found scattered throughout the Pauline collection, including the Pastorals, are among those topics that have received extra apostolic authorization from 2 Timothy.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Here Philemon is named first, before the Pastorals.

¹⁰² As Towner remarks: “... the letter presents itself as Paul’s last From the perspective of the Pauline corpus, or the Pauline story, this is the final chapter” (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 79).

¹⁰³ ἐάν γάρ μυρίους παιδαγωγούς ἔχητε ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀλλ’ οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας, ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα. παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε. διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον, ὃς ἐστίν μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ, ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδούς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καθὼς πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω, 1 Cor 4:15–17. See also 1 Thess 3:1–6; esp. Phil 2:19–24; 2 Cor 1:19; and Timothy named as sender of letters: 2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1; Col 1:1; 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1; Philemon 1.

¹⁰⁴ Here is where the aim of reading the letters, especially 2 Timothy, separately helps to understand how each might then have functioned as components of collections.

Thus far, I have used the term “reading strategy” to describe a process of interpreting the Pastorals individually, as well as intra- and inter-textually within their letter collections. As I have already explicated in Chapter One, within the Greco-Roman culture such “reading” would be an oral and aural experience, most often in a group setting.¹⁰⁵ Compared to the use of the Pythagorean letters, we know more about the actual utilization of Christian texts, since, beginning with the Jewish Scriptures, texts were read aloud in communal worship and educational settings. At least by the early second century, newer Christian writings, such as the letters of Paul and the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, were proclaimed alongside the older texts.¹⁰⁶ But even earlier, Paul’s letters would have been read aloud to the communities to which they were sent. Paul certainly expected that this would happen, as seen in his command in 1 Thessalonians: “I adjure you in the Lord that this letter is to be read to all the brothers and sisters.”¹⁰⁷ In the Pastorals, the pseudonymous Paul directs Timothy: “until I come, devote yourself to the reading, the exhortation, the teaching.”¹⁰⁸ This command foresees Timothy reading some text aloud to the community, an activity that is linked to similar leadership acts of exhortation and teaching.

Gamble describes such a situation in the Christian assemblies: “In the early period, and long afterward in small communities, there may have been no more than one or two who had the ability [to read]. The task of reading inevitably fell to the literate, and because the congregation depended upon them for its access to texts, a great importance accrued to [the readers].”¹⁰⁹ In order to attain this kind of literacy, these Christians would most likely have come from higher social levels. Thus, in the Paulinist communities, when believers repeatedly heard that person’s voice “performing” a text, and relied on their sense of how that text should be read, it is no wonder that the reader’s role in the group became aligned with the authoritative offices in an already hierarchical household setting. The potent combination of wealth and higher social status with literacy skills may very well undergird the restriction of church offices to males that is found in the Pastorals, where

¹⁰⁵ The relationship between orality and textuality in the early church is delineated by Gamble (*Books and Readers*, 21–41, 214–218).

¹⁰⁶ Justin says that at the Sunday worship “the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read,” τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, *Apol.* 1.67.

¹⁰⁷ Ἐνορκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, 1 Thess 5:27.

¹⁰⁸ Ἔως ἔρχομαι πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim 4:13.

¹⁰⁹ *Books and Readers*, 220.

the author connects teaching with the offices of the ἐπίσκοπος (Titus 1:9) and πρεσβύτερος (1 Tim 5:17).

Since the stated addressees of these letters—Timothy and Titus—are both dead, the intended audience of the pseudepigraphical Pastorals reads, or rather, *listens*, “over the shoulders” of the two male apostolic delegates.¹¹⁰ Moreover, the entire audience of believers, steeped in the heritage of Paul, would not only listen to various letters being read in worship, but are themselves commanded to learn from them. The author of the Pastorals envisions the ultimate audiences for the letters as composed of both women and men in the communities of his time and place. He refers to persons of both sexes who are on the receiving end of his teachings, sometimes pairing instructions for men and women in succession, as in 1 Tim 2:8–15; 3:8–13; 5:1–2; and Titus 2:2–8. From this structuring, it is justifiable to assume that women heard his teachings for men, and vice versa. Certainly gender specific directives would be of interest to everyone, and perhaps even more for the “opposite” gender in some cases. The same would be true for the paired references to old and young in 1 Tim 5:1–2; 5:9–15; and Titus 2:2–8: both older and younger would hear the teaching to those in the other category. Also, presumably, those not holding church offices would listen to instructions for the overseers, elders, and deacons. Whether this assisted individuals to hold others accountable to the “Pauline” teaching on various roles—to charge them with misdeeds or mismanagement—is not known. However, there is this order to Timothy: “Do not take up an accusation against an elder, except that from two or three witnesses,”¹¹¹ which suggests that church elders at least were sometimes subject to criticisms.

This particular Christian employment of texts for moral formation stands in contrast to the supposed but indefinite historical uses and settings of the Pythagorean letters. The two pseudepigraphical collections succeed from different bases: the Pythagoreans were in the fortunate position that there were no texts with which their letters could be compared, while the Pastorals’ author could weave in Pauline thoughts and details to promote the verisimilitude of his compositions. Nonetheless, both corpora manifest the goal of providing written instruction for the moral-philosophical curriculum; both (but in different ways) deal with specific *topoi* related to house-

¹¹⁰ This is Rosenmeyer’s phrase to explain the appeal of reading “someone else’s mail” (*Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 307).

¹¹¹ κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων, 1 Tim 5:19.

hold conduct and relationships. It is within this educational context that the Pastoral Letters function as textual resources for the moral training of believers in the author's communities. By using the famous apostolic pseudonym to compose letters that clearly reference other Pauline letters, and positioning them in a small collection that imitates a larger *Corpus Paulinum*, the author of the Pastorals added literal and metaphorical weight to the preexisting Pauline collection. Presumably he believed that his quotations and interpretations of various teachings from Paul were not only consistent within the letters he himself composed, but also harmonized across the entire aggregated collection. By incorporating traditional moral-philosophical material under the name of Paul, he likewise sought to show how Pauline thought and practice conformed to the social conventions of his time. In any case, as with the Pythagorean letters, both ancient and modern readers must examine the Pastorals in relation to their letter collection(s). Then they must seek through multiple re-readings to comprehend the interlocking components in these paraenetic letters composed to contribute to the moral training of women, as well as men, in the assemblies.

CONCLUSION

Since the intended audience of the Pastorals would have included both men and women, and since Pauline letters were read aloud and studied by entire communities, persons of both sexes and all ages would have heard the instructions for people of other social statuses. As we will see in the next chapter, the author expected that the appointed *male* leadership of the *ekklēsia* would bear significant responsibility for enforcing the gender-based standards of conduct. Older women were also given the task of holding younger women to specifically feminine moral demeanor. Yet, because the reading of the letters (the Pastorals as well as the rest of the Pauline corpus) was such a communal experience, other social pressures would surely also have been brought to bear on individuals who deviated from the author's teachings. In certain situations, spouses might feel justified in reminding each other of "Paul's" support for marriage. A master or mistress could direct their slaves by referring to these instructions. Believing friends could discuss Pauline views of the moral nature of women and men. Even how one behaved in the presence of inferiors (younger persons, children, and slaves) might be remarked upon, so that one would be made aware of setting a faithful example for them. The author of the Pastorals wanted

the public reading of the Pauline letters to create a comprehensive network of social accountability, a network founded in the household but then extended into each and every house church.

CHAPTER SIX

TEACHERS AND LEARNERS

The pseudonymous author of the three Pastorals must surely have thought of himself as a faithful teacher of the household of God since he has assumed not only the name of the revered teacher Paul but has also taken up the apostolic responsibility for correct instruction of Christian communities. His own epistolary teaching role is echoed in the letters' firm focus on the issue of which persons may be designated as approved teachers within the house churches. On the one hand, he takes pains to certify the passing down of traditional instruction through a lineage of official teachers beginning with Timothy and Titus. On the other hand, he attempts to spell out guidelines to determine who ought to be rejected as teachers, guidelines which exclude some males as well as all females, with one gender-specific exception.

Accordingly, in this chapter I first analyze the author's conceptions about teachers, and in particular how they were expected to serve as examples for the rest of their believing communities. By assuming the name and thus the influence of the apostle Paul, the author endorses Paul the teacher as an example to be followed by students of his gospel. The use of the recipient pseudonyms, Timothy and Titus, likewise sets up these two men as exemplary teachers, and establishes through them an authentically Pauline succession of male teachers for the churches.

Secondly, I examine the author's opinions about those placed in the position of learner, and especially what he supposes about the younger female learners, since the author articulates several explicit prescriptions for the instruction of female believers that are distinct from those for males. As is well known, he prohibits women from entering the teaching offices in the assemblies, and carefully circumscribes their position as subordinate learners. Yet, since the pseudonyms of the *male* sender and *male* addressees construct an epistolary relationship between a teacher and his students, how does this aspect of pseudepigraphy affect the teaching of and learning done by women through the letters? To my knowledge, this question has not been considered in prior scholarship. Even though Fiore's extensive analysis of the use of example in the Pastorals discusses Paul as an exemplary figure, it does not examine the situation of female believers in

particular.¹ Most other work on the pseudonymous Pastorals looks at how Paul's name authorizes the teachings in the letters, but pays no attention to its gender-differentiated learning situations.² My attention to women's learning seeks to fill this gap in the research, and to propose a more comprehensive view of the instructional aims of the author.

My conclusion is that the male teachers ("Paul" included) cannot act fully as moral examples for women; that is why, as the one exception to his prohibition of female teaching, the author puts forward older women as the "good teachers" for younger women. These female teachers serve as exemplary figures for their learners in the same ways the female Pythagorean pseudonymous authors model virtuous behavior for their supposed recipients and audience. What is more, the perception of young women as in particular need of moral instruction is also shared by the authors of the Pythagorean letters. However, the Pastorals' author discloses a persistent anxiety about the ways in which women are involved in the educational process as learners: since as females they are in his view more easily led astray by heretical teachers and by their own desires, he insists that all women, but especially the younger ones, ought to remain in their socially prescribed subordinated roles as a reinforcing barricade against inappropriate learning. In contrast to the "Pythagoreans," this author's concern about impropriety among (younger) women grows out of his different audience and its communal context.

TEACHERS IN THE PASTORALS

Male Teachers

The author of the Pastoral Letters chose to write under the name of the apostle Paul, a man whose renown was founded on his apostolic work traveling around the eastern Mediterranean, spreading "the gospel" and establishing churches among the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη).³ I will not rehearse here all the subsequent studies of Paul's life and activities that demonstrate his enormous influence on early (and now later) Christianity. Suffice it to say that the Pastorals' author had one very good reason for adopting the name "Paul," and for

¹ *Function of Personal Example*, 198–208, 219–222.

² This is true of Donelson's significant project (*Pseudepigraphy*) as well as other investigations which I have reviewed in the Introduction.

³ Rom 1:5; 11:13; 15:15–18; Gal 2:7–9.

including various references to his travels, companions in mission,⁴ opponents, imprisonment, preaching and teaching: by writing under the name of Paul, he positions his letters to be accepted as authentically Pauline pieces of epistolary instruction.⁵ In acquiring the authority of the name of Paul, he⁶ also hoped that his letters (within a collection) would contribute to the transmission and proper interpretation of the Pauline teachings for a later generation.

What requires more explication is the function of the Pastorals' adoption of an authorial pseudonym that *presents the named author as a teacher* of his stated recipients, and through them, as a teacher of later readers. First of all, there is no doubt that the Paul of the Pastorals is known for the composition of didactic letters: the letter form adapted by Paul, and then by the author of the Pastorals is that of the moral-philosophical letter. As with the letters of Seneca, and the pseudonymous letters ascribed to Cynic, Socratic, and

⁴ Donelson comments that the Pastorals' author "weaves a life-like world in which Paul, Timothy, and Titus carry on the personal and public business of Christian apostles" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 55).

⁵ This authorial influence is enhanced by the early Christian reliance on *apostolic* writings; as Donelson says of 1 Peter, Jude, Ephesians, Colossians, James, and 2 Thessalonians, "Pseudonymity [*sic*] was employed in these cases primarily because apostolic and especially Pauline authority was useful" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 54).

⁶ Perhaps it is a simplistic assumption, but it seems probable to me that the real author of the Pastorals is a man, in that his letters advocate a male-only group of teachers in the assemblies. In addition, the world of the Pastorals is mostly populated by male actors. There are only five women's proper names in the Pastorals: Eve (1 Tim 2:13–14); Lois and Eunice (2 Tim 1:5); Prisca (2 Tim 4:19); Claudia (2 Tim 4:21). Compare these with twenty-seven men's names: Timothy; Hymenaeus (1 Tim 1:20 and 2 Tim 2:17); Alexander (1 Tim 1:20 and 2 Tim 4:14); Adam (1 Tim 2:13–14); Phygelus (2 Tim 1:15); Hermogenes (2 Tim 1:15); Onesiphorus (2 Tim 1:16; 4:19); Philetus (2 Tim 2:17); Jannes (2 Tim 3:8); Jambres (2 Tim 3:8); Moses (2 Tim 3:8); Demas (2 Tim 4:10); Crescens (2 Tim 4:10); Titus (2 Tim 4:10; Titus 1:4); Luke (2 Tim 4:11); Mark (2 Tim 4:11); Tychicus (2 Tim 4:12; Titus 3:1); Carpus (2 Tim 4:13); Aquila (2 Tim 4:19); Erastus (2 Tim 4:20); Trophimus (2 Tim 4:20); Eubulus (2 Tim 4:21); Pudens (2 Tim 4:21); Linus (2 Tim 4:21); Artemus (Titus 3:12); Zenas (Titus 3:13); and Apollos (Titus 3:13); six of these are used more than once: Timothy, Hymenaeus, Alexander, Onesiphorus, Titus, and Tychichus. All of the named opponents in the Pastorals are men: Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim 1:20); Phygelus and Hermogenes (2 Tim 1:15); Hymenaeus and Philetus (2 Tim 2:17); Demas (2 Tim 4:10); Alexander (2 Tim 4:14). Some negative cloud also seems to cover Crescens and Titus (2 Tim 4:10), but no women are *named* as opponents.

Although no scholar has suggested this option, it is, of course, possible that a woman wrote these letters under the name of Paul in order to get across her opinions on the correct interpretation of Pauline teaching; we should not assume that every woman would be opposed to the patriarchal worldview expressed in the Pastorals. It is interesting to speculate about what would have happened if a female author had been found out. Would the letters lose their Pauline authority because they were written by a woman? Or would the name of "Paul" give the letters immunity from too much scrutiny in any case?

Pythagorean authors, the Pauline corpus seeks to convey instructions about how to live, which are given to their audience in the forms of advice, command, admonition, censure, etc. Even though all the Paulines exhibit some differences from other philosophical letters—by employing proofs drawn from Paul’s theological background and discussing ethical behavior within the assemblies of believers—they share a common purpose of seeking to instruct by means of texts, specifically letters (and in some cases, letters-in-collections).

Secondly, Paul is clearly designated as “teacher,” as F.M. Young notes: “Paul is presented as an instructor, a *didaskalos* (1Tim 2:7), and the content of the letters rehearses his instruction.”⁷ In fact, in 1Tim 2:7 and 2Tim 1:11, the Pastorals emphasize the “oral discourse” of Paul’s ministry by adding the title of διδάσκαλος (ἐθνῶν) along with that of κήρυξ to the chief role he elsewhere claims for himself, that of ἀπόστολος.⁸ “Paul” himself states that he has had an authoritative teaching role with certain people: Timothy (1Tim 1:18; 3:14; 6:14; 2Tim 1:13; 2:2; 3:10, 14; 4:1); Titus (1:5); and even Hymenaeus and Alexander (1Tim 1:19–20).⁹

Thirdly, while within the fiction of the letters, Paul is at the apex of the God-appointed teaching hierarchy, he has delegated the teaching role to his younger subordinates Timothy and Titus. These two are charged with various instructional practices designed to direct the believers’ conduct in the household of God.

Various terms describe *Titus’* interaction as teacher of students; he is told to “rebuke them severely” (ἐλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως, Titus 1:13b); to “say what is appropriate for the healthy teaching” (Titus 2:1); to “exhort” (παρακάλει, Titus 2:6) the younger men; to show integrity “in his teaching” (ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, Titus 2:7); to “say these things and exhort and rebuke with all authority” (ταῦτα λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς, Titus 2:15ab); to “remind them” (ὑπομίμνησκε αὐτοῦς, Titus 3:1a); “to confirm” (διαβεβαίωσθαι, Titus 3:8b); and to give an “admonition” (νουθεσίαν, Titus 3:10b).

⁷ διδασκαλία, 1Tim 1:10; 4:6; 2Tim 3:10, 16; Titus 1:9 (*Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 89).

⁸ E.g., Rom 1:1; 11:3; 1Cor 1:1; 15:9; 2Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1; cf. also Eph 1:1 and Col 1:1, as well as the first verse of 1Tim, 2Tim, and Titus.

⁹ “Some people, by rejecting [faith and a good conscience] made shipwreck of their faith; among whom are Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I have handed over to Satan so that they might be disciplined not to blaspheme,” ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν, ἣν τινες ἀπωσάμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐνανάγησαν· ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν, 1Tim 1:19–20. Here the subjunctive παιδευθῶσιν more likely means “they might be chastized” than simply “they might be educated”; BDAG, s.v. παιδεύειν.

Having been given an explicit “command” (παράγγελία) by Paul,¹⁰ *Timothy* likewise is depicted in the role of teacher of learners in the *ekklēsia*: he is to “command certain persons” (παράγγειλῃς τισίν, 1 Tim 1:3); to “lay out these things to the brothers” (ταῦτα ὑποτιθέμενος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, 1 Tim 4:6a); to “command and teach these things” (παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε, 1 Tim 4:11); and explicitly to “pay attention to the reading, the exhortation, the teaching” (πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim 4:13), which is reiterated soon thereafter: “fix your attention on yourself and the teaching” (ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim 4:16). Timothy is told “do not rebuke an older man, but encourage [him] as a father, younger men as brothers, older women as mothers, younger women as sisters in all purity” (1 Tim 5:1–2), yet he must “rebuke the sinners in front of everyone” (τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε, 1 Tim 5:20). These actions are summed up in the general imperative: “teach and exhort these things” (ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει, 1 Tim 6:2e).

The evidence from 2 Timothy is similar: Timothy needs to “remind [them] of these things, charging [them] before God” (Ταῦτα ὑπομύνησκε, διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Tim 2:14), and he must “guide the word of truth correctly” (ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, 2 Tim 2:15c). In fact, “the servant of the Lord must not be combative, but gentle toward all, *skilled at teaching*, bearing up under evil, *chastising* his opponents with humility” (δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἥπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδακτικόν, ἀνεξίκαχον, ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, 2 Tim 2:24–25a). Again, Paul charges Timothy to carry out the activities of a teacher: “I charge you before God and Christ Jesus, ... proclaim the word, be ready when it is convenient or inconvenient, rebuke, warn, exhort, in all patience and in teaching” (Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ... κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον, ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ, 2 Tim 4:1a, 2). Timothy’s teaching finds additional authentication when the author makes known that Timothy has access to Paul’s books and parchments (2 Tim 4:13).

Thus far, the Pastorals can be understood as instructional letters, purportedly written by Paul, the “head teacher,” whose (very real) absence requires him to delegate teaching responsibilities to two younger men who have

¹⁰ ταύτην τὴν παράγγελίαν παρατίθεμαί σοι, τέκνον Τιμόθεε, 1 Tim 1:18a. Another authorization of Timothy by Paul is found in 1 Tim 5:21, “I charge you before God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels.” Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων (with the first seven words exactly paralleled in 2 Tim 4:1).

already been trained in his tradition of the faith. Ironically, given the pseudographic situation of the letters, neither Titus nor Timothy is actually available in person for any further teaching.¹¹ But because “Paul” told them to “hand over these things to faithful men who will be competent to teach others also” (ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέροους διδάξαι, 2 Tim 2:2), the chain of transmission of the Pauline tradition is portrayed as remaining unbroken. It extends from one faithful man (Paul) to his immediate subordinates (Titus and Timothy), and on to still more male teachers: the faithful men (2 Tim 2:2), the *episkopos* (Titus 1:9; 1 Tim 3:2) and the elders (1 Tim 5:17; cf. Titus 1: 5–9). These unnamed leaders of the assemblies stand in for the leaders of the author’s own time, in that the author envisions Paul’s teachings (as detailed in the letters themselves) being passed down to him as an treasured inheritance, a *παράθήκη* (1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:12, 14).

Female Teachers

That from start to finish the approved teaching succession relies upon *male* office-holders is emphasized by the author himself. Two well-known verses address directly the possibility of women teaching: “Let a woman learn in silence in all subordination; but I do not permit a woman to teach, or to have authority over a man, but to remain silent” (1 Tim 2:11–12).¹² Since the Christian communities are composed of both women *and* men, this effectively rules out women as teachers of the group as a whole, both during the time of the author and for many centuries to follow.

¹¹ The real author might have expected his audience to assume that Titus and Timothy saved these precious letters from their father in the faith because they contained Pauline teachings as well as these authorizing remarks.

¹² According to Wagener, the first person ἐπιτρέπω is an element of the letter-form, and “verankert das Verbot direkt im Willen des ‘Paulus’” (*Die Ordnung*, 75). Wagener offers a careful exegesis of this pericope (*Die Ordnung*, 67–113), one that is adopted in part by Merz (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 274–279).

There is much debate about the meaning of ἀθνετεῖν. Wagener links it to διδάσκειν, saying, “Das mit οὐδέ angeschlossene zweite Verbotselement führt nun nicht inhaltlich etwas Neues ein, sondern expliziert und konkretisiert das Vorhergehende: Das διδάσκειν wird als ein ἀθνετεῖν ἀνδρός interpretiert und als solches verboten” (*Die Ordnung*, 75–76; also, 100). Merz reviews many of the interpretive options, and likewise determines on various grounds that the two infinitives, διδάσκειν and ἀθνετεῖν are related, with the first being a specific exercise of the second (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 288–295, 294). I agree with Merz that when used to prohibit women’s actions, both terms take on negative connotations, so that: “*Jedes Lehren von Frauen ist daher im Sinne des Verf. als Akt der Dominanz abzuweisen*” (*ibid.*, 294; her italics).

As proofs of the prohibition, the author brings in two events from Genesis 2–3.¹³ Merz understands these in a chiastic relationship with the prohibitions of v. 12:

- A I do not permit a woman to teach
 B nor to have authority over a man,
 B¹ For Adam was fashioned first, then Eve (v. 13),
 A¹ and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was thoroughly deceived
 in transgression (v. 14).¹⁴

The order of Creation—man first, woman second (v. 13)—explains why a woman may not domineer over a man (as in the act of teaching), but must remain in subordination (ὑποταγή). Clearly this common interpretation of the creation of humankind ascribes priority, and thus leadership, to Adam, while God's fashioning of Eve from Adam makes her subordinate, both temporally and relationally.

Verse 14 addresses the second, more substantive, reason why women are not allowed to teach in the assembly: “the woman” was more vulnerable to the wiles of the serpent.¹⁵ Furthermore, not only was “the woman,” whom the author believes represents “all women” from Creation onward, more susceptible to temptation, but Hellenistic Jewish interpretations of Genesis 3 frequently viewed her temptation within a sexualized context.¹⁶ The most important source for our purposes is Paul himself, who wrote in 2 Cor 11:2–3: “For I am jealous for you with the jealousy of God, for I betrothed you to Christ in order to present a pure virgin to one husband; but I am afraid lest, as the serpent thoroughly deceived [ἐξηπάτησεν] Eve in his cunning, your thoughts might be seduced from the sincerity and purity toward Christ.”¹⁷

¹³ Merz's study makes the appealing assertion that the reference to Genesis 2–3 in 1 Tim 2:13–14 is the author's way of clarifying the phrase καθὼς ὁ νόμος λέγει of 1 Cor 14:34 (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 338–339).

¹⁴ Ibid., 295.

¹⁵ See Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 295.

¹⁶ Wagener traces this thinking from the Hebrew Bible, through the LXX, the *Apocalypse of Moses*, rabbinic texts, and Paul's use of the story in 2 Cor 11:3 (*Die Ordnung*, 105–106). She concludes: “... das die Beweisführung in 1 Tim 2:14 nur auf dem Hintergrund dieses erotischen Verständnisses der Sündenfallerzählung verständlich wird ...” (ibid., 106). She links the notion that women are easily sexually tempted (as well as erotically *tempting*) to the teaching on modest adornment in 1 Tim 2:9–10 (ibid., 110).

¹⁷ ζηλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζηλω, ἡρμოსάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ· φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως, ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὐάν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος [καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος] τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν. Note the use of ἐξαπατᾶν in both texts. Wagener comments on one difference between the use of Eve's temptation

The eroticized connotation of the temptation of the woman by the serpent, when combined with the opposite, and correct “response” posited for Adam (who “was not deceived”), is sufficient reason for the Pastorals to deny teaching positions in the house churches to all women (who are “daughters of Eve”), while allowing the possibility that any man (as a “son of Adam”) might aspire to that office.¹⁸

Using these justifications from Genesis 2 and 3, the author, as is commonly recognized, prohibits women from stepping into a teaching office. Yet Titus 2:3–5 offers one approved and limited avenue for female teachers:

Older women likewise [are to be] in a reverent demeanor, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, good teachers [καλοδιδασκάλους], so that they might instruct the young women in *sōphrosynē*, to be loving of husbands, loving of children, *sōphrōn*, pure, good house-workers, subordinated to their own husbands, so that the word of God might not be defamed.¹⁹

in 2 Corinthians and 1 Timothy: the former is used metaphorically, as “Veranschaulichung seines Anliegens,” while the latter is used “als Stütze theologischer Aussagen oder ethischer Anweisungen” (*Die Ordnung*, 106). Merz traces the strong intertextual relationship between 2 Cor 11:2–3 and 1 Tim 2:14 (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 344–358). She observes rightly that the Pastorals have shifted the focus from that of 2 Corinthians, wherein the *entire body of believers* (rather than the female sex alone) likened to a virgin bride and to Eve (*ibid.*, 351).

¹⁸ That community leadership is potentially open to all men is stated in 1 Tim 3:1b: “If *any man* aspires [to the] office of overseer, he desires a good work.” Wagener states: “Wenn also in 1 Tim 2:12 den Frauen das Lehren untersagt wird, so ist damit nicht ausgesprochen, daß den Männern insgesamt die lehrende Verkündigung zugestanden wäre. Allerdings steht ihnen grundsätzlich der Zugang zum Amt offen. Umgekehrt schließt die Ausbildung des Amtes die Frauen als Gruppe prinzipiell und faktisch von den entsprechenden Funktionen aus” (*Die Ordnung*, 103). I agree, always remembering that these positions seem to have been open only to male heads-of-household, and not to male slaves or dependent male children (e.g., the “young men” of Titus 2:6–8?); perhaps too, poor men were effectively sidetracked from these offices.

¹⁹ As I noted in Chapter Five, if the original order of the Pastorals collection was Titus – 1 Tim – 2 Tim, then on a first reading the instructions for women teaching other women would set the stage for the prohibition in 1 Timothy. In any case, re-readings of the collection, and intersecting readings of the Pastorals with the other Paulines, might lessen the sense of priority of the instructions in Titus. In fact, “Paul’s” view that women ought not to teach both men and women in the communities in 1 Tim 2:11–12 would be corroborated by re-readings of the Pauline corpus, which contains the command in 1 Cor 14:34–35. Wagener exegetes this “Lehrverbot” in relation to 1 Cor 14:33b–36 (*Die Ordnung*, 92–104), with a review of scholarship on the question of whether the 1 Corinthians verses are a later interpolation (*ibid.*, 92–93). See Merz’s analysis of the intertextuality of these two texts (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 334–339). Merz holds the position that 1 Cor 14:35–36 is a later interpolation, but says that for her argument this is irrelevant; whatever Pauline collection the author of the Pastorals possessed contained 1 Cor 14:34–35. See Mitchell’s summary of Merz on this point (“Corrective Composition,” 45–47).

It is explicitly stated that women of faith may only teach female students, while maintaining the hierarchy of older teaching younger.²⁰ Not only that, older women teachers are restricted to dealing with subject matter that links feminine moral progress to the socially-acceptable roles for women in the household.

However, given the obvious relational and physical points of connection between the household and the house church, this teaching task of the older women does bestow a virtual (though subordinated) leadership position upon such female teachers. Within the construction of the Titus 2, the older women receive their teaching commission from Paul, acting through his delegate Titus (Titus 2:1, 3). Once again, since both male worthies are long dead, by means of the textually-authorized succession the male teachers of the author's communities would most probably be expected to approve and supervise the older women at this activity. With such an appointment process in place, the virtues and vices listed in Titus 2:3 thus serve as the qualifications for selecting appropriate older women as teachers. According to the author, those "qualifications" include:

²⁰ This conclusion is made by Quinn, "The [subjunctive] clause is so constructed that it links the directives for the older women with the younger while subordinating the latter to the former and at the same time enabling the apostolic minister to practice what he teaches. The 'right teachers' for the 'younger women' in the home are not Paul and Titus, just as in 1Tim 2:12 a wife is not a suitable teacher for her husband in a liturgical assembly" (*Letter to Titus*, 135). Quinn conceives of two different educational settings: the home and the liturgical assembly. Other interpreters think that the author refers to mothers teaching their daughters. Osiek and Balch state: "[In 1Timothy 2:12] it is a question of public teaching in the assembly involving both sexes, while here [Titus 2:3–5], it is the private household, where mothers pass on to daughters what male society expects of them" (*Families in the New Testament World*, 168). Merz leans in this direction as well, saying, "... In Tit 2:3–4 geht es ganz speziell um Frauenbelange, die ein Vater seine Tochter nach damaligen Verständnis nicht so gut lehren konnte wie eine Frau" (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 302). Johnson has a similar view of Titus 2:3–5: "The instructions to older women recognize their special role in the household in two ways. First, Paul emphasizes their responsibility to provide a model of dignity Second, Paul recognizes their authority to teach *within the household* (2:3) In particular, the older women have the responsibility of being 'good teachers' of the younger women" (*Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 234; my italics). Johnson understands the "household" in the letter to Titus to be only the "domestic" household, not the assembly or the "household of God": "The larger life of the assembly is not in view here" (*ibid.*, 232). But given the complex relationship between household and house church in the early Christian movement, especially as conveyed in the Pastorals, this distinction between household and house church seems to me to be difficult to maintain. Therefore, the identities of the older and younger women of Titus 2:3–5 are not to be restricted to mothers and their daughters, even though the subject matter of the instruction revolves around women's household roles.

(1) ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς: Quinn translates this phrase “as reverent in demeanor as priests,” noting that “the terminology is not found elsewhere in the NT and occurs only in the Maccabean stratum of the LXX (3 Macc 5:45; 4 Macc 9:25; 11:20).”²¹ What is important for understanding this description is that the word κατάστημα “can suggest an internal quality as well as external deportment”²² The twofold meaning reflects the ancient belief that inner moral excellence will be exhibited in one’s external looks and actions. This “deportment” is given a sacred aspect with the unusual addition of the word ἱεροπρεπεῖς, which could remind the alert reader of 1 Tim 2:9–10.²³ While the Pastorals consistently perceive “appropriate” outer behaviors as expressions of inner ethical virtues, which in turn are given specific theological justifications,²⁴ in both of these instructions, the conduct of women teachers is considered to be an expression of an expressly *womanly* form of piety.

(2) μὴ διαβόλους: The phrase “not slanderers,” applied here to older women teachers, also appears in the qualifications for female deacons (or wives of deacons) in 1 Tim 3:11: “Likewise [it is necessary] for women to be dignified, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.” Mentioning this kind of hurtful speech-act in relation to women evokes the enduring perception that their talking is problematic: it is probably better for a woman not to speak much at all.²⁵ Such a perception must lie at the foundation of the author’s command for women to learn ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ (1 Tim 2:11). That the older female teachers need to learn to avoid slander stands in direct lineage to the behavior of the younger widows, who are described as “gossips and busybodies, saying

²¹ *Letter to Titus*, 118. For other parallels, see also Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, vol. 2, 618; and Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 139–140.

²² Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 118.

²³ 1 Tim 2:10. This connection is made by Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 140.

²⁴ One relevant example is the author’s claim in Titus 2:11–12: “For the grace of God appeared for salvation for all people, educating us that by repudiating impiety and worldly desires, we might live moderately and justly and piously in the present age,” Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι.

²⁵ An exemplary assessment comes from Plutarch: “... she ought to be as ashamed of her voice as of being stripped naked, and to guard it from outsiders; for her passion and character and disposition are observed when she speaks,” τὴν φωνὴν ὡς ἀπογύμνωσιν αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ φυλάττεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτός· ἐνοράται γὰρ αὐτῇ καὶ πάθος καὶ ἦθος καὶ διάθεσις λαλοῦσης, *Advice, Mor.* 142D (31). Bassler summarizes: “Warnings about excessive or inappropriate speech abound in Greek and Roman ethical discourse, where silence was the ideal for women (Aristotle *Politics* 1.5.8; Plutarch *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, 32) and where talkative women or the complaining wife was a stock figure for ridicule or reproach (Juvenal *Satires*, 6.398–402; Plutarch, *How to Profit by One’s Enemies* 8)” (1 *Timothy*, 2 *Timothy*, *Titus*, 194).

things that should not be [said]" (1Tim 5:13b–c). But the vice of harmful speech is not limited to women, since it appears also on the list of vices the author predicts for male opponents (ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ... βλάσφημοι ... διάβολοι ...) in 2Tim 3:2–3. Furthermore, in these letters every act of "slander" is linked to the work of "The Slanderer," ὁ διάβολος (1Tim 3:6–7; 2Tim 2:26).

(3) μηδὲ οἶνω πολλῶ δεδουλωμένας: The requirement to avoid drunkenness,²⁶ with its opposite "to be sober" (νηφάλιος),²⁷ is given to both women and men in the Pastorals. In general, indulging in alcoholic drink leads to a failure of *sōphrosynē*.²⁸

(4) καλοδιδασκάλους: As noted before, this word may be translated either "teachers of what is good" or "good teachers."²⁹ Either translation works to describe the role of the older vis-à-vis the younger women: for this particular scenario, the title of "teacher" is awarded, with the additional connotation that it is a "good" thing.

The four descriptors of the older women lead up to a ἵνα clause with the subjunctive σωφρονίζωσιν, highlighting that it is the superior moral quality of the older women that prepares them to teach the younger women on the subject of feminine virtue, which the older women already embody in every respect.³⁰ Otherwise, they would not be approved as either the "good teachers" or "teachers of what is good."

Teachers as Examples for Imitation

In his role of apostle, Paul serves as the foremost teacher who is worthy of imitation by all of his students.³¹ First of all, Paul is established as an example

²⁶ 1Tim 3:3, 8; 5:23; Titus 1:7.

²⁷ The adjective is found at 1Tim 3:2, 11; Titus 2:2; the verb at 2Tim 4:5.

²⁸ North traces the belief that *sōphrosynē* applies in a particular way to moderation (or "temperance") in drink (*Sophrosyne*, 20–21, 76, 95, 191, 330).

²⁹ Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 120.

³⁰ That is, as Fiore states, "the upright conduct of older women renders them *kalodidaskaloi* who, because their lives are in order, can teach or rather *sōphronizein*, younger women and instil [sic] virtue in them" (*Function of Personal Example*, 217; my italics).

³¹ Donelson states, "Both 1 and 2 Timothy are letters which articulate a portrait of Paul and then use that portrait as a *paradigm* which gives content and direction to the parenesis in the letters" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 100; my italics). Fiore's work on teachers as examples reviews the ancient literature; he treats Paul as an example in the Pastorals (*Function of Personal Example*, 198–208). Fiore focuses there on 1Tim 1:3–20; 2Tim 1:3–18; and 2Tim 3:1–4:8. Regarding the authentic Pauline letters, he devotes one paragraph to the issue of "Other Members of the

by the epistolary prescripts of the Pastorals. In all three he is called “apostle of Christ Jesus,”³² with the letter to Titus having the longest characterization:

Paul, a slave of God, an apostle of Jesus Christ, for [κατά] the faith of the elect of God, and for [κατά ellipsed] knowledge of the truth that is for [κατά] piety, in hope of life eternal which the trustworthy God promised from all eternity, but he revealed in his own time his message in a proclamation with which I was entrusted, at the command of our savior God.³³

Taking each κατά with the accusatives as conveying a sense of purpose,³⁴ “Paul’s” apostolic role thus has the objective of “generating” faith and knowledge of the truth that is for piety. This means that, although not everyone can become an apostle, they can use Paul as an authoritative role model of the faithful person, which is how he depicts himself in the other Paulines. Even though the letter to Titus otherwise contains no evident details of Paul’s life, short descriptions can be found in the letters to Timothy,³⁵ so that if one reads the Pastorals as a mini-collection, and also cross-references them with other Pauline letters,³⁶ then the repeated exhortations in Titus to seek after “good deeds” would have Paul, his life and his faith, as their chief referent.

Community [sic] as Examples,” saying, “Paul’s example is the pre-eminent one in his letters and others, who share that function, do so in direct and explicit relation to his example” (ibid., 189). See also Mitchell, who connects “Paul’s use of himself as the example of proper behavior” to the deliberative rhetoric of 1 Corinthians (*Paul and the Rhetoric*, 49–50). When an author positions himself as a role model, this is related to the idea that a speaker’s *ethos* is one of the proofs for his argument. Castelli provides a socio-rhetorical analysis of the “power relations” involved in the imitation of a superior by a subordinate person (*Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*, 1991).

³² Titus 1:1 has the reversed “Jesus Christ.”

³³ Titus 1:1–3: Παῦλος δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ’ εὐσέβειαν ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, ἐφανερώσεν δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγὼ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ. 1 Timothy 1:1 reads like a rearranged abridgment of the Titus ascription: “Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus according to the command of God our savior and Christ Jesus our hope,” Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν. 2 Timothy 1:1 begins “Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God according to the promise of life that is in Christ Jesus,” Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

³⁴ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1690. This seems reasonable to me considering that Paul’s apostleship is not conveyed as a title only, but as having the consistent purpose of taking the gospel to the Gentiles.

³⁵ 1 Tim 1:12–16 and 2 Tim 1:3–4, 8, 15–18; 3:10–11; and 4:6–18). Regarding imitation of Paul, the most significant is 2 Tim 3:10–14, examined below.

³⁶ As additional textual sources for Paul’s biography, I would include Acts, and perhaps as well the *Apocryphal Acts of Paul*; D.R. MacDonald draws connections between the Pastorals and this text, linking the latter to oral traditions about Paul (*The Legend and the Apostle*, esp. 17–21, 23–26; and a chapter on the social location of the storytellers, 34–53).

In the Pastorals no μιμ-cognates are used, as in other Pauline letters,³⁷ that would indicate an explicit appeal for imitation of Jesus and/or Paul by the epistolary audience. Instead, in the teacher-student relationship suggested by the Pastorals, “following” stands as a synonym for “imitating.” While repeatedly asserting that his own behavior is the correct way for a Christian to live,³⁸ “Paul” here commends Timothy as a good disciple because “You *followed* my teaching, way of life, purpose, faith, patience, love, endurance, persecutions, all the sufferings that befell to me in Antioch, in Iconium, in Lystra, whatever persecutions I have borne, and the Lord rescued me from all of them. And all those who wish to live piously will be persecuted in Christ Jesus.”³⁹ Here the author highlights Paul’s imprisonment and suffering for the gospel, and warmly commends Timothy for “following” that way of life. Ironically, even though the prediction is made that “all those who wish to live piously will be persecuted,” the author nonetheless appears to urge his audience to avoid conflicts with the non-Christian world, including: “I urge then first of all that entreaties, prayers, petitions, [and] thanksgivings be

³⁷ “You also became imitators of us and of the Lord,” καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου, 1Thess 1:6a; “For you yourselves know how it is necessary to imitate us,” αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε πῶς δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς, 2Thess 3:7; “Not that we have authority, but so that we ourselves might give a type to you for imitating us,” οὐχ ὅτι ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δώμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς, 2Thess 3:9; “Therefore I urge you, become imitators of me,” παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε, 1Cor 4:16; “Become imitators of me just as I am of the Lord,” μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε καθὼς καὶ ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ, 1Cor 11:1. “Become co-imitators of me, brothers and sisters, and consider your life-conduct just as you have us as a type,” συμμιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτω πειπατοῦντας καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς, Phil 3:17. Another Pauline reference to imitation is: “For you, brothers and sisters, became imitators of the churches of God that are in Judea in Christ Jesus,” ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 1Thess 2:14. Cf. also, “Therefore, become imitators of God as beloved children,” γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά, Eph 5:1.

³⁸ E.g., 2Tim 1:8–12; 4:6–8.

³⁹ Σὺ δὲ παρηκολούθησάς μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ, τῇ προθέσει, τῇ πίστει, τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ, τοῖς διωγμοῖς, τοῖς παθήμασιν, οἷά μοι ἐγένετο ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις, οἷους διωγμοὺς ὑπήνεγκα· καὶ ἐκ πάντων με ἐρρύσατο ὁ κύριος. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες ζῆν εὐσεβῶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διωχθήσονται 2Tim 3:10–12. The word “follow,” παρακολουθέω is used in 1Tim 4:6, here with respect to Timothy *following* Paul’s teaching. Since παρακολουθεῖω and ὑποτύπωσις refer to both Paul’s life and his teaching, we can perceive the seamless connection the author makes between his life and his teaching. Similarly, “Paul” commands Timothy “not to be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner, but share in the sufferings [συγκακοπαθέω] in the gospel in the power of God,” μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῆς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μηδὲ ἐμέ τὸν δέσμιον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ δύνάμιν θεοῦ, 2Tim 1:8; cf. also 2Tim 2:3. This recalls the connection between imitation of the Lord and Paul and their sufferings in 1Thessalonians 1:6–7; cf. also Phil 1:7; 1Thess 2:14–16; 2Tim 2:3.

made on behalf of all people, on behalf of kings and all who are in authority, so that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all piety and dignity.”⁴⁰ Still, Paul’s life is invoked as an example for Timothy and other readers to follow in their own lives. Therefore, since the Pastorals are pseudepigraphical letters, their use of the name of the apostle Paul puts him forward as a revered figure from the past not only to obtain influence over an audience, but also to offer Paul as a trustworthy example to be emulated.

Historically speaking, Paul is no longer literally available as a role model, so the author calls him a “*prototype* for those who are going to believe on him [Christ Jesus] for life eternal.”⁴¹ That is, Paul was the original *τύπος*, especially for Gentile believers, but that situation is now in the past. Time has moved on, and the role of *τύπος*, along with the deposit of Paul’s teachings, has passed on to his subordinates, so that both Timothy and Titus are directed to act as a *τύπος*: “Be a *type* of the faithful in word, in way of life, in love, in faith, in purity,”⁴² and “... offering yourself as an *type* of good works ...” (Titus 2:7).⁴³ In these two instances, it is clear that the role of “model of the faith” has itself been handed down by Paul, along with his authority and tradition of teaching, to his subordinates Timothy and Titus (and from there, we can assume, to the overseers and elders of the churches of the author’s time and place).

The present inquiry raises a question too rarely asked: how were Paul, Timothy, Titus, and the succession of male officials, expected to act as *τύ-*

⁴⁰ Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διαγῶμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι, 1 Tim 2:1–2; see also, 1 Tim 3:7, where overseers are to be well thought of by outsiders. Such “peaceable living” is reiterated with respect to women in 1 Tim 5:14, where socially respectable roles are urged for the younger women “to give the opponent no opportunity at all for verbal abuse.” (Admittedly, this “opponent” may be one of the heterodox teachers, not a non-Christian.) Behavior of slaves is also potentially problematic; “As many slaves are under a yoke, let them consider their own master as worthy of all honor, so that the name of God and the teaching might not be blasphemed,” “Ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότηας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους ἡγείσθωσαν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βλασφημῇται, 1 Tim 6:1.

⁴¹ πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεῦειν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, 1 Tim 1:16. The translation “prototype” is suggested by the word *πρῶτος* earlier in this verse, and the idea that over time, others “are going to believe.” Donelson discusses this further (*Pseudepigraphy*, 102–103). Similarly, Paul’s teaching is a *ὑποτύπωσις*, in 2 Tim 1:13: “Have the *prototype* of the healthy words which you heard from me in faith and love in Christ Jesus,” ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων ὧν παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

⁴² τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν ἀναστροφῇ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πίστει, ἐν ἀγνείᾳ, 1 Tim 4:12.

⁴³ This process also echoes another Pauline letter, where the Thessalonians “became a *type* for all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia,” ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστευουσιν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, 1 Thess 1:7.

ποῖ for the *women* in the letters' audiences? Or, roughly put: can a male apostle, overseer, or elder model faithful behavior for women?⁴⁴ This question does not simply arise from modern feminist sensibilities; rather, it is a problematic situation perceived by the author himself, whose expectations of virtuous behavior are based on an ideological conviction that gender-differentiation results in distinct moral actions for women and men. When he commands the male church leaders to give instructions, based on his written teaching, he envisions an audience composed of both women and men. As just one example of parallel paraenesis for each sex, "Paul" states, "Then I want [βούλομαι] *men* in every place to pray, raising up holy hands without anger and disputation; likewise also [I want] women to adorn themselves in decorous bearing with modesty and *sōphrosynē* ..." (1Tim 2:8). This is followed by teaching for women (1Tim 2:9–3:1a). Such textual instructions particular to women are filtered through men, coming first from "Paul," but then by means of the stated (male) recipient of the letter, who is charged with communicating Paul's message. In this way, the *stated* author of the letters and his designated (male) delegates have the responsibility and the right to teach women, not only about correct Christian doctrine, but also about proper ethical behavior. The *real* author conceives of this teaching as occurring in part through the male office-holders reading the letters to the whole communities, and through further authorized oral instruction by the men that is consistent with the content of the letters.

And yet we can see that none of these Christian men can act as a role model in every facet of virtuous behavior for the women in the communities. The author makes this plain by expressing concern about and limiting Timothy's and Titus' positions as younger men instructing younger women. Timothy's teaching relationship with younger women receives an important caveat: he is to encourage the "younger women as sisters *in all purity*" (1Tim 5:2b). Then Titus is steered away from dealing directly with young women, as may be graphically illustrated by a concise outline of Titus 2:1–15:

⁴⁴ For example, reading 2Tim 3:11–14, would women, along with "Timothy" and other Christian men, imagine themselves as walking in Paul's shoes when he was imprisoned? Did the author think that women too could "share in the sufferings," and if so, how? Of course, whoever wrote *Acta Thecla* did envision women in such circumstances. The same is true of Clement of Alexandria who wrote the discourse: "Women As Well As Men, Slaves As Well As Freedmen, Candidates for the Martyr's Crown" (*Strom.* 4.8).

- I. *Titus* commanded to teach (v. 1)
 - A. *Titus* to teach older men (v. 2)
 - B. *Titus* to teach older women (v. 3)
 - B'. *older women* are the “good teachers” for young women (vv. 4–5)
 - C. *Titus* to teach younger men (vv. 6–8)
 - D. *Titus* to teach slaves (vv. 9–10)
- II. *Grace of God* educates everyone (vv. 11–14)
- III. *Titus* commanded again to teach (v. 15)

The young women are placed in a subsidiary position, “under” the older women, separated from *Titus*’ wide-ranging teaching role. His detachment from the young women is underlined by the clear directive that he is to act as a *τύπος* for the younger men (*Titus* 2:6–7). The younger women are portrayed as particularly “dangerous” in 1 *Tim* 5:11, where they “are governed by strong physical desires against Christ.” In fact, “some have already turned away after Satan” (1 *Tim* 5:15). In 2 *Timothy*, there is the strong rebuke of “frivolous women” who have been successfully “captured” by some vice-filled men (3:5–6). All these comments suggest that the author believes that younger women need to be approached carefully by the approved male teachers.

One reason that the men (*Timothy*, *Titus*, et al.) cannot completely model Christian moral behavior for the younger women is that there are many male-specific instructions in the Pastorals that no women could be expected to imitate, since they are not allowed to aspire to the higher teaching offices in the house church.⁴⁵ A strict interpretation of the commands of Paul to *Timothy* would make the following leadership functions off-limits to women in the Pastorals’ readership, simply because they are women: “Preach the word, be ready in season or out of season, rebuke, warn, encourage, in all patience and in teaching be sober in all things, suffer misfortune, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry.”⁴⁶ Neither would the author anticipate that women in his audience would have had hands laid upon them for an official position within the church.⁴⁷ In addition,

⁴⁵ Not every man, but only the office-holders in the assemblies would be expected to follow these commands. Yet every man in the readership was a member of the community that enforces and lives out such instructions. See again Wagener (*Die Ordnung*, cited in n. 18 above).

⁴⁶ *κῆρυξον τὸν λόγον, ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγχον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον, ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ σὺ δὲ νῆφε ἐν πάσιν, κακοπάθησον, ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον*, 2 *Tim* 4:3, 5.

⁴⁷ In the Pastorals, this action (*ἐπιτίθημι*) is reserved for commissioning men: 1 *Tim* 4:14, where *Timothy*’s gift is said to have been given to him by the elders’ laying on of hands; 1 *Tim* 5:22, where *Timothy* possesses the authority to lay on hands; 2 *Tim* 1:6, *Timothy* received the

the author has presented Timothy with three masculine examples of good behavior in 2 Tim 2:3–6: soldier, athlete, and farmer. These emphasize the gendered nature of the teachings given in the Pastorals wherein women's Christian activities differ from those of the approved male teachers.

"Bad" or "wrong" teachers and leaders in the Pastorals also seem to be men, or at least, it seems that it is other *male* teachers who are set in opposition to the approved *male* officeholders. As just one example, after listing the positive qualities for selecting elders and bishops, the letter of Titus says:

For there are also many insubordinate men, vain-talkers, and deceivers, most of them from the circumcision, whom it is necessary to silence, such as are turning whole households upside down by *teaching* what ought not be for the sake of shameful gain.⁴⁸

Perhaps because this author postulates male-only leadership for the Christian communities, he perceives most of the doctrinal and ethical conflicts as happening between opposing men.⁴⁹ Even though the author feels a need to prohibit women from teaching men, in general he portrays women as pawns in the controversies between the authorized Pauline delegates and their opponents. They can bring the household of God and its teaching into ill-repute, but the author does not specifically name women themselves as his opponents.

On the other hand, the author clearly positions the older women in one sex-specific teaching role, acting as exemplars of Christian moral activities for the younger women.⁵⁰ This has already been established directly in

gift of God through the laying on of Paul's hands; see also, Acts 6:6 (for seven male deacons); 13:3 (for Barnabas and Saul).

⁴⁸ Εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται, μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς, οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν, Titus 1:10–11. The battle over authoritative teachers is quite intense in the Pastorals, as evidenced by this statement: "For there will be a time when they will not put up with the healthy teaching, but because they will feel an itching of their ears, they will accumulate teachers according to their own desires, and they will turn away from the truth, and will turning toward myths," ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωρεύουσιν διδασκάλους κνηβόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν, καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἀκοήν ἀποστρέψουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς μύθους ἐκτραπήσονται, 2 Tim 4:3–4.

⁴⁹ See n. 6 above.

⁵⁰ Noting that a teacher's exemplary behavior is essential for classical education, F.M. Young states: "... in Titus 2:3 ff. older women are specifically charged with setting an example, with being *kalodidaskaloi* Exemplary conduct and instruction are envisaged as proceeding from the top down, and those who learn are subject to authority" (*Theology of the Pastoral Let-*

Titus 2:3–5, where the older women are the *καλοδιδάσκαλοι* for the younger women, but it is also suggested by the author's comparisons of older and younger widows in 1 Timothy 5:3–16, and by the naming of Timothy's mother and grandmother as faithful women in 2 Tim 1:5. Because of the gender ideology of the author, the highest teaching position for women involves virtue training for younger women, which would include the significant component of modeling behavior appropriate to their sex.

Therefore, if male church officials cannot, according to this author, serve as complete examples for Christian women, what does this say about Paul himself as a role model for women in the Pastorals' readership? Except for the author's interpretation of Pauline theological content that each believer was expected to espouse and to practice,⁵¹ is there anything in Paul's *lived faith* that the author wants women to imitate? Or, to invert my question, is there any aspect of women's lives as depicted in the Pastorals that intersects with that of Paul, and thus opens the possibility for them to imitate him? On the basis of the author's limitation of offices (apostle, teacher, overseer, elder, and possibly deacon and evangelist) to men, we can safely assume that he would not want Christian women to imitate closely any of Paul's activities in those arenas. This inference is solidly reinforced by his recommendation and restriction of women to the three household roles of mother, wife, and household-mistress (1 Tim 5:14; Titus 2:4–5), although admittedly, these roles are echoed in the women's approved roles within a house church. Then, since we have absolutely no tradition of Paul's life within a household (except, again, within the "household of God"),⁵² yet the women of the Pastorals' communities are positioned by the author within the conventional household, there is little opportunity for their imitation of the life of the apostle Paul, even though his name has been taken up as the writer of the letters.⁵³ The sex difference between Paul and the women

ters, 79); later she reiterates, "Discipline and proper honour, respect, subordination, obedience, were keys to instruction, though much instruction implied imitation of the example set by one's superiors" (ibid., 82–83).

⁵¹ If one reads through the many blessing, prayer, and hymnic formulas in the Pastorals with the picture of an audience of men and women in mind, these do not seem to be directed at one sex or the other. For instance, while the *manner* of praying might differ for men in 1 Tim 2:8 and women in 2:9–10, still believers of both sexes are supposed to pray; cf. 1 Tim 5:5.

⁵² In fact, Paul's life on the road seems quite far removed from daily household routines; see 2 Cor 11:23–28 for his own listing of the sufferings he experienced as an apostle (also, 2 Tim 1:8, 11–12, 16; 3:11; 4:6–7, 16–17). Likewise, he comments on the value of remaining single: 1 Cor 7:7–8, 32–25, 38, and 40; cf. also, 1 Cor 9:5, where Paul reiterates that he is unmarried.

⁵³ Of course, neither are the male householders in the Pastorals encouraged explicitly to

has extended into the gender-divergent roles assigned to men and women in the “household of God.” Indeed, this disconnect between the female believers and “Paul” (and other male church leaders) is the reason the author absolutely *must* offer the older women as examples for the younger women. Otherwise, a situation might arise similar to that depicted in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, where a woman is definitively portrayed as patterning her life after that of Paul as baptizer, traveling teacher, prisoner, and arena-contestant, a woman who, like Paul, is able to endure hardships and suffer persecutions for the faith.

LEARNERS IN THE PASTORALS: RECIPIENTS OF PARAENESIS AND REBUKE

The Pastorals’ representation of the house church as an educational setting means that some approved persons (almost all of whom are male) serve as teachers, whereas the bulk of the group remains in the position of learners; thus our author fills out the teaching-learning structure by numerous references to persons who are being taught.⁵⁴ In relation to God, everyone, even Paul, is a learner, as Titus 2:11–12 claims: “For the grace of God appeared for salvation *for all people*, educating [παιδεύειν] *us* that by repudiating impiety and worldly desires, *we* might live moderately and justly and piously in the present age.”

Male Learners

Historically, Titus and Timothy stand in the position of the first two “learners” of Paul, who is designated “teacher” by God (1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11). In part due to their epistolary form, the Pastorals make use of a variety of terms that consistently call these named addressees to mind. Some examples are second-person singular pronouns (σου/σου/σοι/σε)⁵⁵ and a few vocatives,⁵⁶ not to mention the many (necessitated) second-person finite verbs. All such

take up Paul’s lifestyle, except that Paul has placed himself in the metaphorical role of “father” of believing communities in 1 Cor 4:14–21.

⁵⁴ F.M. Young observes: “Teachers need learners, and the verb ‘to learn’ (*manthanō*) occurs six times (though not the noun [*mathētēs*]) ...” (*Theology of the Pastoral Epistles*, 78). The six instances of the verb are: 1 Tim 2:11; 5:4, 13; and 2 Tim 3:7, 14 (2×).

⁵⁵ 1 Tim 1:3, 18; 3:14; 4:12, 15, 16; 5:23; 6:11, 13, 14; 2 Tim 1:3, 4 (2×), 5 (2×), 6, 18; 2:1; 3:10, 14, 15; 4:5 (2×), 15, 21, 22; Titus 1:5; 2:1; 3:8, 12, 15; also σεαυτῷ, σεαυτόν, 1 Tim 4:16; 2 Tim 2:15.

⁵⁶ 1 Tim 1:18 (τέκνον Τιμόθεε); 6:20 (ὦ Ω Τιμόθεε); 6:11 (ὦ ἄνθρωπε θεοῦ); 2 Tim 2:1 (τέκνον μου).

terms fashion a textual relationship between the sender and the ostensible individual addressee in which the supposed subordinate is directly taught by an author who is superior (in experience, education, and age). Because the named recipients of these three letters are male, no women are addressed in the second person by the author, a fact that serves to reinforce the chain of command from one male teacher to another, down into the real author's time and place.

As with the Pythagorean letters, there are no return letters from the stated recipients back to the sender. In this way, the epistolary situation effectively constructs Timothy and Titus as silent learners, so that the author may conduct an instructional monologue under Paul's authority. "Paul" has the power to offer paraenesis to them on how to organize house churches and their leaders, how to suppress opposition, how Christian theology is to be expressed in ethical living, and even on the most personal of subjects: "use some wine on account of your stomach" (οἶνω ὀλίγω χρῶ διὰ τὸν στόμαχον, 1 Tim 5:23). His tone toward these two is generally warm and friendly, while he reserves his worst rebukes for their imagined opponents.⁵⁷ In the fiction of the Pastorals, Timothy and Titus are portrayed as good students of Paul's teachings, which is one reason why "Paul" does not censure them, but instead only "reminds" them in paraenetic fashion of what they have already learned.

Paul points out that Timothy was and is a learner: "you [should] continue in the things you learned and believed, knowing from whom you learned, and that you have known the holy writings from childhood, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus."⁵⁸ Timothy is also commanded "train yourself toward piety,"⁵⁹ which places him in an

⁵⁷ The Pastorals' critiques of various opponents, and especially their wrong approach to "Christian" education seem almost contradictory to the approach to the opponents proposed in 2 Tim 2:24–26: "But it is necessary for a servant of the Lord not to do battle, but to be gentle towards all, a skilled teacher, enduring evil, chastising the opponents in meekness; lest God might give them repentance to knowledge of the truth, and they might come to their senses from the snare of the devil, after being captured by him to do his will," δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἥπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδακτικόν, ἀνεξίκακον, ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μήποτε δώῃ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.

⁵⁸ σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστάσῃς, εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἔμαθες, καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας, τὰ δυνάμενα σε σοφίσει εἰς σωτηρίαν διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 2 Tim 3:14–15.

⁵⁹ γυμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, 1 Tim 4:7b. The image continues: "For bodily training is somewhat beneficial, but piety is beneficial in every respect, because it has the promise of life now and for the future," ἡ γὰρ σωματικὴ γυμνασία πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ὠφέλιμος, ἡ δὲ εὐσέβεια πρὸς πάντα ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν, ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης, 1 Tim 4:8.

educational setting by the words γυμνάζειν and γυμνασία.⁶⁰ The necessity of learning is also emphasized by Paul's command: "Think over what I say. For the Lord will give to you understanding in everything."⁶¹

Titus as a good learner stands out against those in Crete whom he is to reprimand: "For this reason rebuke them [the insubordinate men] sharply, so that they might be healthy in the faith but you say what is appropriate for the healthy teaching."⁶² Titus is already on the "healthy" side of this equation, while the problematic men, who are greedy teachers (Titus 1:11), must be brought back to health by Titus himself. The Pastorals imagine Titus as a true child of Paul, with the commission to "Say these things and encourage and rebuke with all authority; let no one despise you."⁶³

Timothy and Titus are constructed as younger than Paul (they are his "children"),⁶⁴ and they are named as "heirs" of his deposit of teaching; in the construction of the letters, they would have outlived him. In fact, their youth is something of a problem for them in the teaching role, in that there are other believers who are older than they.⁶⁵ Since Timothy and Titus are no longer living, their actual age is now irrelevant: instead, they hold a high rank as authoritative teachers known from the Pauline past. Their chief importance as learners-turned-teachers is as the sanctioned inheritors of the Pauline tradition, who are able in turn to provide authorization for the Pastoral letters and for the male teachers in their intended audience(s).

In contrast to those who need sharp rebukes, some persons within the assemblies are depicted as learning in an appropriate way, and they simply need "reminders" from Titus or Timothy. A general statement to this effect is given in 1Tim 5:1–2: "Do not reprove an older man, but encourage him as a father, younger men as brothers, older women as mothers, younger women as sisters in all purity." Titus receives a shopping list of ethical

⁶⁰ These words are used for physical, mental, military, and rhetorical "exercises"; LSJ, s.v. "γυμνάζω" and "γυμνασία."

⁶¹ νόει ὃ λέγω· δώσει γὰρ σοι ὁ κύριος σύνεσιν ἐν πάσιν, 2Tim 2:7.

⁶² δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἔλεγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως, ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει Σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ, Titus 1:13; 2:1.

⁶³ Ταῦτα λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγε μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς· μηδεὶς σου περιφρονεῖτω, Titus 2:15. This command echoes 1Tim 4:11–12a: "Command these things and teach. Let no one look down on your youth," παρὰγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ διδάσκε. μηδεὶς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω.

⁶⁴ He calls each of them "child," τέκνον, 1Tim 1:2, 18; 2Tim 2:2; Titus 1:4; cf. 1Cor 4:17 and Phil 2:22.

⁶⁵ 1Tim 4:12 and 5:1–2 refer explicitly to Timothy's youthful age. 2Tim 1:5 gives the sense that Paul has known Timothy quite a long time, since he knows Timothy's grandmother and mother, and something of his childhood (2Tim 3:15); 2Tim 2:22 urges Timothy to "flee youthful desires," τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε. By assuming Timothy's and Titus's youth, the author is able to legitimate younger men who might hold church office in his own time.

behaviors to set out when “reminding” (ὑπομιμνήσκω) his assemblies (Titus 3:1–2), an instruction that is echoed in the later statement: “Let our people *learn* [μανθάνειν] also to show concern for good works for pressing needs, so that they might not be fruitless.”⁶⁶ Thus, the “learning” advocated in the Pastorals is not just that of correct, or “healthy,” theological doctrine; instead, learning means knowing how to act virtuously in relation to God and to other persons. For example, “But if some widow has children or grandchildren, let them learn [μανθάνειν] first to show piety to their own household and to make a return to their progenitors. For this is acceptable in the presence of God” (1 Tim 5:4). Ethical acts in this life have a theological foundation: they are commanded and observed by God.

Female Learners

Turning our attention to female learners in the Pastorals, we find that an appropriate learning process for young women is portrayed in Titus 2:3–5: they are to be taught by the older women who offer instruction via the method of σωφρονίζειν. As I have already shown, these young women are separated syntactically and practically from Titus, the primary male teacher, and are instead given older women as their good teachers in order to meet the special need for virtuous female examples. Since each of the “feminine” qualities and behaviors to be learned is found in other moral-philosophical texts that address the *topos* of “the good woman,” the subject matter at first appears to be paraenesis, so that the younger women only need to be *reminded* of these things, rather than taught them from scratch.⁶⁷ So far,

⁶⁶ μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας, ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν ἄκαρποι, Titus 3:14.

⁶⁷ Because he thinks the letter to Titus is indeed written by Paul, and thus really addressed to Titus in Crete, Johnson has a decidedly odd take on these verses. He comments: “The virtues themselves [in vv. 4–5] are well attested in the literature What is surprising is that these are qualities that need to be taught. Is this a sign of the savageness and incivility of the native population, that responses ordinarily thought to be ‘natural’ should require teaching?” (*Letters to Paul’s Delegates*, 234). Later he repeats this idea: “When looking at the instructions, we wondered what sort of world required young women to be taught to love their husbands and children. It appears that civilization, and culture, are not necessarily ‘natural’ and that the habits of the heart that build communities of meaning and of meaningful relationships can be forgotten and lost or abused and destroyed. Sometimes civilization needs to be taught for the first time to the savage heart or relearned by the heart grown savage” (ibid., 240). Johnson ignores the paraenetic elements of the letter, and seems to have ill-advisedly taken up “Paul’s” prejudicial citation about Cretans from Titus 1:12: “Some one of them, one of their own prophets, said ‘Cretans are always liars, wicked beasts, idle gluttons,’” εἶπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης, Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύδεται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

the learners are depicted as capable of making moral progress: they are like Kleareta, Phyllis, and Kallisto of the Pythagorean letters.

However, the author has used the ambiguous term *σωφρονίζειν* for the activity of the older women teachers, and this verb may express something about his perception of female learners. Troels Engberg-Pedersen identifies in Philo's writings two recipient-groups for *σωφρονίζειν* and *νουθετεῖν*: one is intransigent and unable to learn or to change for the better, while "the people in the other group are however "unwillingly" capable of reformation, though only unwillingly and through fear."⁶⁸ In which group would the author of the Pastorals place the young women of Titus 2:3–5: are they intransigent or capable of reformation? His use of *σωφρονίζειν* might indicate his real uneasiness about young women as learners. Yet, the content of the older women's teaching in Titus 2:4–5 is framed in positive terms of ideals to live up to, rather than in terms of what actions must be avoided or changed. So perhaps the author thinks these women are capable of training after all.

While the author does not spell out in Titus 2:4–5 what immoral behavior of the young women might include, he shows some serious concerns about the learning process for women in particular. This is seen in the fact that "women" are linked to "learning" three out of the six times that *μανθάνω* is used in the Pastorals.⁶⁹

- (1) 1Tim 2:11–12: "Let a woman *learn* [*μανθάνετω*] in silence in all subordination; but I do not permit a woman to teach, or to have authority over a man, but to remain silent."
- (2) 1Tim 5:13: "At the same time they [the younger widows] are *learning* [*μανθάνουσιν*] unproductively, going around from house to house, and not only being unproductive, but also gossips and busybodies, saying things that should not be [said]."
- (3) 2Tim 3:6–7: "For among these men are those who enter houses and capture frivolous women who are loaded up with sins, being led by various desires, always *learning* [*μανθάνοντα*] and never able to come to a knowledge of truth."

⁶⁸ "Paraenesis Terminology in Philo," 389.

⁶⁹ 1Tim 2:11; 5:13; 2Tim 3:7. Two of the other instances are applied to Timothy himself (2Tim 3:14), and the sixth to the group of persons who have widows in their families (1Tim 5:4). Similarly, the derogatory descriptions of the younger widows in 1Tim 5:11–13 and of the "frivolous women" of 2Tim 3:6–7 give further evidence of his fears about women who have gone astray, and who are in need of some correction.

Wagener has extensively analyzed the connections between these three descriptions of female learners in the Pastorals (but not that of the young women in Titus 2), and I use her findings in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the Pastorals' portrayal of how believing women ought to learn.

Wagener first takes up 1Tim 2:11–12, which displays a succinct chiasmic pattern:⁷⁰

A *learning* (Let a woman learn in silence in all subordination),

B *teaching* (I do not permit a woman to teach),⁷¹

B¹ *teaching* (or to have authority over a man),

A¹ *learning* (but to remain silent).

These verses articulate the two sides of any educational process, but strikingly, they locate women on the learning side only. As Wagener notes, the emphasis here lies more on the prohibition of women's teaching than on a concession (or some encouragement) that woman *may* learn.⁷² Still, the command for women's silent learning functions as an intensification of the teaching prohibition, with the use of ἡσυχία at both the beginning and the end to explain the proper attitude of female learners.⁷³ The word ἡσυχία may mean both "silence" (meaning "quiet") and "rest" (meaning "not moving").⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Wagener does not use the term "chiasmic" but adopts Roloff's description of "ein Nebeneinander von zwei antithetischen Parallelaussagen" (*Die Ordnung*, 95; citing Jürgen Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* [Zurich: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1988], 128). See also nn. 12 and 19 for further description of Wagener's analysis of these verses.

⁷¹ Significant here is the substitution of λαλεῖν for διδάσκειν in 1Cor 14:34b, since the Pastorals also use λαλεῖν for the teaching action Titus is commanded to perform (Titus 2:1, 15). Wagener notes that λαλεῖν appears elsewhere in the Pastorals only in 1Tim 5:13, which will be important when considering that instruction (*Die Ordnung*, 206).

⁷² *Die Ordnung*, 75.

⁷³ Also, "subordination" is repeated with the command not to have authority over a man (*ibid.*, 95–96).

⁷⁴ The English word "stillness" reflects both the absence of sound and movement, as I have translated ἡσυχία in *Theano to Nikostrate*, line 13. Wagener examines the range of meanings for ἡσυχία, and the difference between ἡσυχία and σιγῆν (the latter found in 1Cor 14:34; *Die Ordnung*, 97–100). Merz discusses the relationship between women's ἡσυχία here, and the ἡσυχία as one component of an ethical life lived under a dominant political authority, found in 1Tim 2:2 (*Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 280). See also Mitchell on the historical context of and intertextual connections of 1Tim 2:1–8 and the other Pauline letters ("Corrective Composition," esp. 47–56). The social and individual aspects of ἡσυχία are connected by Wagener: "Das Ideal der Ruhe, das durch ἡσυχία ausgedrückt wird, hat also gleichzeitig die Konnotation der pflichtgemäßen Erfüllung der eigenen Rolle und der akzeptierenden Einfügung in die gegebene Ordnung" (*Die Ordnung*, 99). This idea of "peaceful existence" as fulfilling one's proper social role is of course entirely at home in the worldview of the

In either case, women are expected to take on the more passive position of recipients who do not contradict their teachers.⁷⁵ Accordingly, the correct posture for a female believer to exhibit is that of a docile learner, open to being taught by approved teachers, as exemplified in the learning process recommended for the young women of Titus 2.

Such an expectation is underscored by the phrase “in all subordination,” which is the proper stance of learners toward teachers in ancient educational enterprises. The social hierarchy of the Pastorals places children in subordination to fathers,⁷⁶ slaves to masters,⁷⁷ and women to men. In each of these relationships, one’s status in the Roman household is duplicated within the house church. However, the command for female learners in 1 Tim 2:11 does not mention *to whom* exactly the women are to subordinate themselves, which opens up the interpretation that the author: “... ein umfassendes Verständnis von Frauenexistenz in Unterordnung vorausgesetzt ist.”⁷⁸ The command in Titus 2:5 is for young women “to be subordinated to their own husbands,” so that when these letters are read as part of a Pastorals corpus, the teaching from Titus 2 correlates with that of 1 Timothy 2. In addition, the author of the Pastorals might have wanted to clarify and extend the reach of 1 Cor 14:35: “If they [women] wish to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home, for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the assembly.”⁷⁹ The combined meaning of these instructions is that all believing women are considered subordinate persons, and that they ought to demonstrate this subordination toward their husbands, and really

Pastorals. Furthermore, this “peacefulness” has political ramifications, as Mitchell asserts: “In the context of the early second century, with the flowering of the imperial cult and of citizenship in the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, and the increasing visibility of the Christian ἐκκλησία in Asia Minor, the Paulinist author wishes to present the mid-first century authoritative founder-figure, Paul, as having commanded his followers to place highest priority on standing in complete alignment with the forces of the *imperium*” (“Corrective Composition,” 49).

⁷⁵ Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 99.

⁷⁶ Wagener notes in this connection that the *episkopos* is to “have children in subordination,” 1 Tim 3:4 (*Die Ordnung*, 107). I would add also, Titus 1:6: “having faithful children who are not under an accusation of debauchery or disobedience.”

⁷⁷ Titus 2:9.

⁷⁸ Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 282. Wagener comments: “Die Unterordnungsforderung an die Frau in 1 Kor 14, 34b und 1 Tim 2, 11 ist auf dem Hintergrund der Haus- bzw. Ständetafeltradition zu sehen, hat sich aber jetzt von dem Bezug zu den Ehemännern gelöst und wird stattdessen auf das gebotene Verhalten im Gottesdienst bezogen” (*Die Ordnung*, 100).

⁷⁹ εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν· αἰσχρὸν γάρ ἐστιν γυναῖκα λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.

toward all believing men, but perhaps especially to all the male leaders who authorized to teach in the assemblies.⁸⁰

The author's "reason" for commanding women to learn in silence appears to be that, due to their "Eve-nature", some women have gone astray in their learning, as he supposes in both 1 Tim 5:13 and 2 Tim 3:6–7. Most translators of 1 Tim 5:13 have chosen to supply the infinitive εἶναι in order to make sense of the statement ἄμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μακθάνουσιν, offering "besides that they learn to be idlers" (RSV; or "learn to be idle," NRSV). Wagener's translation of 1 Tim 5:13 is significant here, in that, while agreeing that the absence of a direct object for the indicative verb μακθάνουσιν is problematic, she points out that it is entirely typical for the author (as in 1 Tim 2:11 and 2 Tim 3:7).⁸¹ Rejecting the supplementing of εἶναι, her solution is to move away from the meaning of ἀργαὶ as "lazy" or "idle" and more toward the idea of "useless" or "unproductive."⁸² This means that "Die Lernbemühungen der jungen Witwen bringen keinen Gewinn im Sinne des in den Pastoralbriefen propagierten christlichen Lebens: Sie führen nicht zu 'guten Werken', wie der Autor sie verlangt."⁸³ That the younger widows are "unproductive" in their learning surfaces in the behaviors that are reproached in the second half of the verse: "going around from house to house, and not only being unproductive, but also gossips and busybodies, saying things that should not be [said]." According to Wagener, the emphasis here lies on the last clause "λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα." Because the Pastorals use λαλεῖν as a synonym for

⁸⁰ Wagener plausibly views the command for female subordination (and the prohibition against women teaching) against a social background where wealthy women (in Asia Minor) are seeking to use their more powerful economic and legal positions to take up leadership roles in the assemblies (*Die Ordnung*, 111). Her position is adopted by Merz (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 278). This reconstruction of the historical situation is supported by Riet van Bremen, "Women and Wealth," in *Images of Women in Antiquity* (eds. Averil Cameron and Amelie Kuhrt; rev. ed.; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993), 223–242.

⁸¹ Even Wagener's translation of this verse finds it difficult to maintain the transitive quality of the verb μακθάνουσιν, reading: "Außerdem bringt ihr ständiges Lernen, während sie in den Häusern umherlaufen, überhaupt keinen Gewinn, mehr noch, sie sind nicht nur nutzlos, sondern auch Schwätzerinnen und solche, die sich frech in ihnen nicht zustehende Bereiche einmischen, indem sie unziemliche Lehren verbreiten" (*Die Ordnung*, 118). Wagener also disagrees with translations that make ἀργαὶ the "cause" of the women's improper learning, as if these younger widows had too much time on their hands (*ibid.*, 205). A comparable English translation would be: "at the same time, since they are idle, they are learning"

⁸² Wagener cites Mt 12:36, Jas 2:20 and 2 Pet 1:8 as three similar uses of ἀργός (*Die Ordnung*, 205–206). This definition corresponds with the idea in Titus 3:14 that connects learning with fruitfulness: "Let our people learn also to show concern for good works for pressing needs, so that they might not be *fruitless*," as Wagener notes (*ibid.*, 206).

⁸³ *Ibid.*

διδάσκειν, the author is now saying that the younger widows' *learning* leads them to make attempts at *teaching*. The result is not simply "unproductive" learning, but even worse: "wrong" or "heretical" teaching.⁸⁴

Here I would add two essential observations to Wagener's exegesis. First, the doubled condemnation of both the value of their learning and the content of the younger widows' teaching suggests a partial "explanation" for the doubled command in 1 Tim 2:11–12 for women to *learn* in silence, in all subordination, and that they are not permitted to *teach*.⁸⁵ Second, the verses in 1 Timothy about women's improper learning and teaching contrast powerfully with the appropriate feminine educational process depicted by Titus 2:3–5. In this way, when read in light of each other, the Pastorals give both positive and negative reinforcement for the teaching of and by women.

Similarly, the author's criticism in 2 Tim 3:6–7 strengthens Wagener's interpretation of 1 Tim 5:13, for in both places he brings some female learners into disrepute, while at the same time condemning those persons (women in 1 Tim 5:13; and men in 2 Tim 3:6–7) who enter other households to spread their supposedly reprehensible teachings.⁸⁶ The γυναῖκες of 2 Tim 3:6–7 are said to be "loaded up with sins, being led by various desires, always learning and never able to come to a knowledge of truth." This is unproductive learning at its worst: to be "always learning," but yet to have it lead nowhere, especially not to a "knowledge of the truth." These "frivolous women" have neither the appropriate teachers (here the heretical opponents), nor the right instructional content,⁸⁷ nor the proper behavior of good (i.e., still and subordinate) learners. In fact, the author says that their very motivations for learning are questionable, because the women are filled with sins and swayed by their desires. If these "desires" include a "desire for learning," then this is not seen as a virtuous quality for believing women to display. As a concentrated solution to such a distorted educational process, the author issues the commands of 1 Tim 2:11–12, in which "... er das Lernen in seinem Sinn als rein passives Empfangen der Lehre umdeutet, das in Stille und

⁸⁴ This means that women have a predilection for "false teaching" (ibid.).

⁸⁵ Wagener hints at this connection between 1 Tim 2:11–12 and 5:13 (*Die Ordnung*, 210, 230, 237), but does not explicitly state this as I have done.

⁸⁶ *Die Ordnung*, 206. The phrases περιερχόμενοι τὰς οἰκίας ... λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα in 1 Tim 5:13 are also very close to the condemnation of heretical teachers in Titus 1:11 "who are upsetting entire households by teaching what ought not [be taught] for the sake of shameful gain," οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν; cf. ibid., 207.

⁸⁷ This, of course, would be what the author understands as the "orthodox Christian faith," as found in all of the "sound teachings" in the Pastorals.

Unterordnung zu geschehen hat.”⁸⁸ As I noted above, the proper teaching of the young women by the older women in Titus 2:3–5 is also part of the author’s solution to controlling the moral education of women

The project at hand draws upon and broadens Wagener’s exegesis of these brief references to women’s learning—1 Tim 2:11–12; 1 Tim 5:13; and 2 Tim 3:6–7—at three points. (1) She clearly demonstrates the interdependencies of these passages, which proves again the importance of studying the letters within their collection(s), as well as in light of the other Paulines (here, especially 1 Corinthians). I propose that Titus 2:3–5 also ought to be read alongside these descriptions since it provides a positive example of the process of women’s moral training. (2) Wagener’s analysis provides evidence for the gender-based ideological and social system of the Pastorals as I have delineated it: one that allocates certain roles and behaviors to women as differentiated from men. And (3), by calling attention to the approved, and disapproved, conduct of women as *learners* and *teachers*, she has given strong support to my argument that the Pastoral Letters intend to set the boundaries for a moral curriculum within later Pauline communities. Certainly, it is not only women who receive instruction, but also Timothy and Titus, along with various social groups, some of which overlap: men, bishops, elders, deacons, widows, slaves, the wealthy, and younger and older persons. The overarching goal of these letters is to supply correct Pauline teaching on any number of subjects, as authorized not only by “Paul,” but ultimately by God: “For the grace of God appeared for salvation for all people, *educating* [παιδεύουσα] us” (Titus 2:11–12a). In the presence of such a teacher, every believer becomes a submissive learner.

CONCLUSIONS AND COMPARISONS

The name of Paul is adopted by the author of the Pastorals in order to position the letters as the work of the famous apostle. By means of this pseudonymity, the author intends to “correct” various teachings of Paul, including those that seek to direct the moral behavior of female believ-

⁸⁸ Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 97. M.Y. MacDonald’s remark on the perception of women in the early church seems apt here: “Marriage could be recommended as an antidote to slander. But we will see that even married early Christian women, who led the quietest and most circumspect lives, could be subject to critical evaluations. Even a small trespass on their part would probably be viewed as an indication of their immoral nature and of the immoral nature of their church” (*Early Christian Women*, 188).

ers in the assemblies. First, Paul is established as the Lord's teacher-par-excellence, while the stated recipients Timothy and Titus stand among his first learners and as heirs of his teaching. From that earlier time until the author's present, a chain of "faithful men" conveys the inheritance to the communities who consider themselves to remain in the Pauline tradition. All of these teachers, named or not, are male, and to them is reserved the "laying on of hands" which signals their worthiness as community leaders. Second, since all these men are teachers in the Greco-Roman social world, what they teach in words must be exemplified in their actions: they serve as paradigms of the moral excellence expected of believing learners.

But, third, a strong ideology of *gender differentiation* coupled with the fact that *both sexes* participate in Pauline assemblies complicates the relationships between teachers and learners. The texts reveal anxiety over the questions: How can Paul and the rest of the male teachers teach women? How can the men serve as examples for women? The author thinks that young men need to be careful of their own piety around young women, and that older women are the "good teachers" for the younger women, primarily because they alone can exemplify a *feminine* ideal of virtue. However, no woman may ever teach a man, and, in fact, women must remain silent and subordinate in their own learning process. The "flawed" genetic material passed down from Eve (second at Creation) to female believers surfaces quickly when they try to learn, and even more so when they extend themselves too far and try to teach. It is best, then, in the author's view, for a faithful woman to confine her demonstrations of virtue to the household responsibilities of the wife, mother, and *despoina*. In these ways, such proper women will serve as teacher-exemplars of feminine virtue, and thus fulfill the one allowed community task of older women teaching the younger ones. In fact, the Pastorals' positioning of older women, and not men, as the most suitable instructors for younger women lends credence to the theory that male authors might have taken on the names of female Pythagoreans in aid of the composition of those letters. Both the Pastoral and Pythagorean corpora then would express the gender-differentiated view that encourages teaching only by a person of the same sex.

Even so, in the Pastorals' opinion, women suffer from a weaker moral ability, which he links to the second-creation and subsequent complete (sexual) deception of their "mother," Eve (1Tim 2:13-14). Because women are more easily deceived, they are restricted in their sphere of activity, and advised to maintain their subordinated household and house church positions. The author believes that such subordination to husbands and to official male teachers ought to bolster the believing women in proper

moral choices and development. The fact that Adam was the first-created and was later “not deceived” means that men’s moral nature possesses a higher (better? stronger?) aptitude, leading to the consequence that men may aspire to the positions of community office, from which women are prohibited. And yet, a tension still remains in the Pastorals regarding men’s ability to progress in virtue. Given the author’s intense censure of heretical male teachers, is there not also some possibility that a man’s theoretically greater moral capacity could, when abused, lead to a greater immorality than that of women? The higher they are, the harder they fall? And when some male opponents do fall into heterodoxy and vice as depicted by the author in 2 Timothy 3, they drag some impressionable women down with them.

When compared with the Pythagorean corpus, the Christian author appears to express a pessimistic opinion about the learning capacities of young women. This surfaces in the theological grounding he puts forward as the justification for women’s subordination: the God-created, but sexually-tempted and fallen female nature of Eve is so persistent in successive generations that it can only be counteracted by childbearing and controlled by male authority. While the authors of Pythagorean women’s letters most probably share the same understanding of women’s social roles,⁸⁹ they do not explicitly comment on the moral disposition of women in general. Neither do they resort to a religious rationale as when the Pastorals depict the bearing of children in and of itself as a means of ultimate salvation for women.⁹⁰ The Pythagoreans appeal more to cultural traditions and to the social concern for shame and honor, rather than to a religious ethic which projects a postmortem examination leading to eternal life (or otherwise).

Much of this difference between the two corpora can be traced to the theological context, expected audience, and social milieu imagined by each letter. First, the Pastorals are, of course, shaped by the Jewish scriptures, as well as by whatever Pauline letters and traditions were at hand, while the

⁸⁹ For example, although *Melissa to Kleareta* does not use the term ὑποτάσσειν to describe a wife’s subordinate position, it does advocate that a husband’s wishes ought to be “an unwritten law” for the wife. On the other hand, *Theano to Nikostrate* appeals more to the κοινωνία of marriage, and the mutual advantage for both spouses.

⁹⁰ The treatise *On the Sōphrosynē* does raise the theological implications of a wife’s adultery, claiming that “she will find no cleansing remedy for this wrongful act, so that she be pure and beloved when going to temples and altars of the gods. For toward this unjust deed even the deity is especially unpardoning,” ὥς οὐδὲν καθάρσιον εὐρήσει τὰς ἀμπλαχίας ταύτας ἄκος, ὥστε ὡς ἱερὰ θεῶν καὶ βωμῶς ποτερχομέναν εἶμεν ἀγνάν καὶ θεοφιλάταν· ἐπὶ γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἀδικία μάλιστα καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἀσυγγνωμόνητον γίνεται Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a [W.-H. 591]).

Pythagorean letters are inspired by other philosophical beliefs and customs. Second, the Pastorals' recipients, though ostensibly singular (Timothy and Titus) as is the case with the Pythagorean letters, are in reality plural, and furthermore, consist of larger groups of both female and male believers. It was the established practice of early Christian groups to gather together for the oral reading of their writings, so that these texts were conceived with that kind of mixed audience in mind. While the Pythagorean letters may also have had a more sizable and diverse audience in mind than just one female recipient, nonetheless their instruction is directed at individual women within their own domestic situations.

Third, the Pastorals envision a more complicated social milieu than do the Pythagorean authors. Within the world of the Pythagorean letters there is little demonstrated perception of women moving within a larger social context, such as an association or a city. Thus, the only advice given about proper female behavior in more multifaceted settings is the counsel to avoid public shame or dishonor, as found both explicitly (e.g., *Theano to Nikostrate*, lines 38–39) and implicitly (e.g., *Melissa to Kleareta*, lines 12–14) in these texts. Conversely, in the experience of the Pastorals' author, the conventional household has been altered by the religious practices and pragmatic requirements of organizing a Pauline house church. Therefore, as David C. Verner concludes, the author "... writes with explicitly stated intention of describing the way that church members ought habitually to behave as members of this *great household*."⁹¹ That is, a believer operates not only within their own personal household, but is also expected to conduct themselves properly within the "household of God," a social construct that has been assembled out of various smaller entities and even individuals. Thus, with an eye to the relative health and safety of the community itself, the author must grapple with the perceived needs of individuals who find themselves participating in this distinctive group of people, which acts as a sort of facsimile of the usual household. Given his assessment of the "great" household of God, the author is tackling a more complex social setting than that found in the Pythagoreans. Additionally, he is conscious that non-believing observers might acquire negative perceptions of

⁹¹ *The Household of God*, 127, my italics. Later, Verner adds, "... to treat the household as a separate topic is to depart from the way in which [the author] conceptualized the Christian community," *ibid.*, 128. Although I agree with Verner that the Pastorals exhibit a complex overlapping of social roles between household and house church, there is yet much teaching for women that is restricted specifically to the more conventional concept of household and that restricts their activities to the three domestic functions.

his communities (e.g., 1Tim 2:7; 5:14; Titus 2:5, 10). Therefore, his views on the aptitude of younger female learners are not therefore more pessimistic than those found in the Pythagorean letters. Instead, the author simply has more occasion (or, need, from his own perspective) to address the educational process specific to female learners.

In conclusion, because the author of the Pastorals considers the faithful community a prime locus for moral instruction, he depicts the members of the assembly as a hierarchy of teachers and learners. A lineage of accredited teachers, almost all of whom are men, has for its main trunk the ministry of Paul the teacher (1Tim 2:7; 2Tim 2:11), which the author has enlisted as an endorsement for his own. Paul is said to be succeeded first by Timothy and Titus, and subsequently by other male leaders, down to the time of the author's present. Younger men are depicted as learners, even Timothy and Titus, as the named recipients of these teaching-letters. In spite of the inferior moral capacity of females, some older women are allowed, even required, to teach younger women in moral behavior, in large part because none of the male teachers can precisely exemplify feminine virtue. In these aspects, the hierarchy of the instructional assembly is further characterized by the genders of both teachers and the learners.

The author foresees several areas in which his educational enterprise has the potential to fail, among them: Timothy and Titus might be inappropriately distracted by teaching women (1Tim 5:2; Titus 2:3–5); believers could become preoccupied with speculative ideas (1Tim 1:4–7); some immoral men could begin teaching erroneous notions (1Tim 4:1–3), and thus lure frivolous women whose abilities to learn are entirely suspect (2Tim 3:1–7); those outside the house church might get the wrong ideas about the community and its message (Titus 2:5, 10). With these and other possible breakdowns in mind, the author stresses the need for qualified teachers as way not only to develop the personal morality of faithful women and men, but also to safeguard their honorable reputation in the arena of public opinion. The older women are thus authorized as the “good teachers” of the younger women, able to train them by example in the correct embodiment of the highest feminine form of *sōphrosynē*.

CHAPTER SEVEN

TEACHINGS STRATEGIES

As components of a larger epistolary collection, the three Pastorals sustain the characteristic Pauline project of conveying religious and ethical instruction by means of written texts, specifically letters. In the Pastorals, the issue of education comes to the fore in a quite conspicuous fashion since the author over and over again directs the reader's attention to the various elements of the instructional process.¹ Having already considered the letters as textual resources, and having described the roles of teachers and learners, I now turn to questions of pedagogy: what do these letters reveal about the author's own teaching strategies? What are his conceptions of the techniques by which others might give instruction? How does the author apply his epistolary instruction to the moral training of women? And in particular for the present project, how does a comparison with the Pythagorean letters inform our understanding of the curricular program envisioned in the Pastorals? My answers to these questions emerge from a careful analysis of relevant epistolary and rhetorical aspects of the letters.

¹ Donelson rightly states that the author of the Pastorals "treats his church more like a school than a cult" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 193). By contrast, philosopher Debra Nails states of the Pythagorean women's texts: "this style of writing is more appropriate to a religious order than a philosophical school," ("The Pythagorean Women Philosophers," 295). The "problem" of school versus cult dissolves when one understands that the background for both sets of writings is moral-philosophical education. Donelson, at least, recognizes this: "The cult becomes a school which teaches the ethical life and a place where students train in the virtues" (*Pseudepigraphy*, 193).

Although Donelson frequently links the author to other "ethicists" (*ibid.*, 91, 109, 145, 155, 162), he understands that the author is primarily concerned with teaching: "... the author claims here that the cosmological warrant, upon which the ethical life and salvation are based, is not only focused upon ethics but is dependent upon an education process. This need for education and the dangers and tasks inherent in carrying it out earn much of the author's attention in the letters. The exhortation to teach, and to teach correctly not incorrectly, is repeated throughout the letters" (*ibid.*, 145). F.M. Young offers this evidence: "... the bulk of these letters is *paraenesis*, ethical advice and exhortation, teaching, in other words. The fact that there are something like seventy imperatives indicates the didactic tone; another twenty-five indirect expressions of command or expectation reinforce the impression" (*Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 78). See also her listing of διδασκ- cognates and other examples of teaching and teachers in the Pastorals (*ibid.*, 75–79).

It is clear that by putting his own writings in the same material form as the Pauline epistolary collection, the author shows that his aim is to teach by means of instructional letters. One primary pedagogical (and rhetorical) strategy displayed in the letters is that of paraenesis: advice and reminders of information the hypothetical reader ought already to know. Yet the author also commands that teachers make rebukes, even while he himself directs some of these toward the opponents. In a step similar to that found in the Pythagorean letters, the author chooses antithesis as the main organizing principle for his instructions, so that the letters' contents seem to oscillate back and forth between "good" and "bad," covering virtues and vices, promises and warnings, and moral and immoral examples. For instance, he sets unambiguous standards for legitimate teachers, for the proper practice of instruction, and for what constitutes "healthy" teaching, but in order to delineate more exactly these approved teachers, methods, and contents, he vilifies their opposites: the bad teachers whose motivations are immoral, whose pedagogy is inappropriate, and whose topics are useless.

As with the Pythagorean letters, this author presumes that his epistolary instructional strategies are applicable to both men and women, in that he utilizes antithetical devices (virtues and vices, rewards and punishments, moral and immoral examples) as means of persuasion, commends teachers as role models, and addresses his paraenesis to all. This blending of gender-differentiated components with the assumption that both sexes possess some capacity for moral progress is common to other Greco-Roman philosophers, and in particular, to the authors of the Pythagorean women's letters. Then again, in comparison, the Pastorals' author expresses more detail about the teaching-learning process in the assemblies: his curricular project names actual teachers and learners, and recommends (and critiques) methods by which moral instruction might take place. Whereas the intended audiences of the Pythagorean letters remain unknown, it ought not to be forgotten that the Pastorals, even though they are "letters to individuals," were clearly composed to be read and used by whole communities of the faithful.

TEACHING METHODS: PARAENESIS AND REBUKE

According to the fictionalized occasions for the letters, Timothy and Titus evidently require some guidance from Paul, or else there would be no reason for the letters to be written. Thus, the Pastorals' author follows the paraenetic epistolary tradition by positing that the two men needed only to be

“reminded” of the commands Paul had previously given to them.² The element of “reminding” appears within the openings to each letter:

*Just as I urged you to remain in Ephesus when I went to Macedonia, so that you might command some people not to teach different things ...*³

(1 Tim 1:3)

For which reason *I remind you* to reignite the gift of God, which is in you through the laying-on of my hands ...⁴

(2 Tim 1:6)

² Scholars generally agree that the Pastoral Letters are paraenetic texts, in that they “... like other paraenetic works, presume knowledge and acceptance of commonly held beliefs and practices and do not elaborate them. Rather, they remind readers of the need to uphold these in the face of those who do not” (Fiore, *Pastoral Epistles*, 7). Cf. also Verner, *Household of God*, 112–125. Quinn claims the letters have a “paraenetic form” (“Paraenesis and the Pastoral Epistles: Lexical Observations Bearing on the Nature of the Sub-Genre and Soundings on its Role in Socializations and Liturgies,” in *Paraenesis: Act and Form* [Leo G. Perdue and John G. Gammie, eds.; Semeia 50; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990], 191). Marshall states that “the Second Letter to Timothy fits most closely into the genre of the personal paraenetic letter, as we know it from elsewhere in the NT and from contemporary sources ...” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 12). This view of 2 Timothy is shared by Johnson (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 322). However, Johnson prefers to read 1 Timothy in terms of “royal correspondence,” an interpretive move that has received much attention (*ibid.*, 137–142), as well as critique by Mitchell (“PTebt 703 and the Genre of 1 Timothy”). Towner summarizes the recent state of the discussion (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 33–35). For my argument, it seems more helpful to focus on the style, content, and function rather than the distinct *forms* of paraenesis texts, as discussed in several papers in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (eds. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen; BZNW 125; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2004). In that volume, Wiard Popkes considers the *function* of paraenetic texts: “to promote attitudes and actions which secure the future of the recipient, both short-term and long-range” (“Paraenesis in the New Testament: An Exercise in Conceptuality,” 13–46; here 17). In his examination of the Pastorals, Popkes concludes that they “present their paraenesis in a variety of literary forms” (*ibid.*, 23). In another essay in that volume, Malherbe considers “... the three features of paraenesis emphasized by participants in the Oslo conference, namely, the conviction that what is advanced does not admit of contradiction, [sic] reminder of moral practices to be pursued or avoided, and the expression of a shared, articulated worldview” (“Paraenesis in the Epistle to Titus,” 297–317; here 298). Popkes adapts this definition for the study of NT paraenesis: “Paraenesis is (1) clear, concrete, benevolent guidance that (2) reminds of practices to be pursued or avoided in the Christian way of life, (3) expresses a shared, articulated world view, and (4) does not anticipate disagreement” (“Paraenesis in the New Testament,” 42–43). For Timothy himself as someone delegated to “remind,” see 1 Cor 4:17: “On account of this I sent to you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, who will remind you about my ways in Christ” (διὰ τοῦτο ἐπεμψα ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον, ὃς ἐστίν μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ, ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδοῦς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ).

³ Καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε προσμεῖναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, ἵνα παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν.

⁴ δὲ ἦν αἰτίαν ἀναμνήσσω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ ἐστίν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου. Also, a sort of reminder is found in 2 Tim 1:18: “and the ways he served in Ephesus, you know better,” καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διηκόνησεν, βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις.

Remember Jesus Christ raised from the dead ...⁵ (2 Tim 2:8)

For this reason I left you behind in Crete, so that you might straighten up the remaining matters and might appoint elders in every city, as I ordered you ...⁶ (Titus 1:5)

Likewise, Titus is given the same task: “Remind them ...” (ὁπομίμνησκε αὐτούς, Titus 3:1). Such statements by the author correspond closely to other ancient paraenetic texts, like *Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis*, and *Theano to Kallisto*, which are intended to provide encouragement to keep on progressing toward a universally-accepted ideal. The characteristic paraenetic device of *reminding* the recipients of previous instructions also underlines the close relationship between “Paul” and “Timothy” and “Titus.”

The Pastorals lack most of the diatribal features found in a letter of censure,⁷ such as *Theano to Euboule* or *Theano to Nikostrate*, which have been analyzed in Chapter Three. For instance, only one rhetorical question appears in the Pastorals, and this is certainly not a means of rebuking the named recipient.⁸ Instead, several indicting statements are included in the instructions for various members of the communities,⁹ but the worst of them apply to alleged opponents of Paul’s work and teaching.¹⁰

Because the letters’ pseudepigraphy is directed toward affirming the work of Timothy and Titus, the author cannot construct them as being in need of major correction. They are the first links in the chain transmitting Pauline traditions; they are honored recipients of letters from the revered apostle; they are assumed to have enacted “Paul’s” teachings in “their” communities;

⁵ Μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγρηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν.

⁶ Τοῦτου χάριν ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ καὶ καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διεταξάμην.

⁷ The definition of this letter type came from Pseudo-Demetrius: “The censorious type is that which is written with rebukes for sins that have been done.”

⁸ The question occurs in 1 Tim 3:5 “if someone does not know how to preside over his own household, how shall he take care of the assembly of God?” In the logic of this letter, this is a general indictment of men who cannot keep their household in order, an expectation echoed for bishops in Titus 1:6; and for deacons in 1 Tim 3:12. Another indictment of believers who do not care for their families comes in 1 Tim 5:8.

⁹ These indictments are often directed toward unnamed, indeterminate individuals who are typified by their social situation: elite men (e.g., those aspiring to be bishop, in 1 Tim 3:5); wealthy widows (1 Tim 5:6); those not providing for relatives (1 Tim 5:8); younger widows (1 Tim 5:11–13); elders who “persist in sin” (1 Tim 5:20); the wealthy (1 Tim 6:17); “frivolous women” (2 Tim 3:6–7); the circumcision party (Titus 1:10–16; who are also “Cretans”); and also, undeterminable “factious” men (Titus 3:10–11).

¹⁰ On this topic, Karris’ study provides the philosophical context for the Pastorals’ criticism of opposition (“The Background and Significance of the Polemic,” 551–556).

they must have, in the fiction of the letters, preserved these very letters, so that this written deposit of the Pauline inheritance could eventually come into the hands of the historical author. For these reasons, the author avoids rebuking Paul's two trusted delegates, and instead aims his intense criticisms at problematic community members (e.g., 1 Tim 1:6–7; 2 Tim 1:15; Titus 3:10–11) and the alleged opponents (1 Tim 1:19b–20; 2 Tim 3:1–9; Titus 1:10–16),¹¹ some of whom have influenced some unnamed women (Titus 3:6–7).

Furthermore, since Timothy and Titus are positioned as reliable imitators of Paul the teacher, they are authorized to adopt his teaching method of rebuking¹² when necessary: two times each addressee is commanded “reprove!” (ἐλεγχε, ἐλεγξον).¹³ Thus, whatever indictments need to be given (in these fictive situations) ought to be conveyed through the persons of Timothy and Titus, and after them, handed over to other “faithful men” (2 Tim 2:2), and so on through the years that are supposed to have passed between the writing of the letter and the time of the author's present communities.

On the other hand, because the authoritative role of rebuking, as with all other leadership tasks of teaching, holding office, and maybe even speaking publicly (1 Tim 2:11–12), is transmitted via a male lineage, and restricted to men, women are certainly not allowed to rebuke men. That kind of

¹¹ Of course, these are not always two mutually exclusive groups, since some of the opponents are within the churches, or at least, came out of them.

¹² “Paul's” approach to Hymenaeus and Alexander in 1 Tim 1:19–20 would fall into this category.

¹³ 1 Tim 5:20 (“rebuke those [elders?] who are sinning,” ἐλεγχε τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας); Titus 1:13 (“for this reason rebuke them severely,” δι’ ἣν αἰτίαν ἐλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως; the antecedent is “insubordinate people [men?], foolish talkers, and deceivers,” found in 1:10); Titus 2:15 (“Say and exhort and rebuke these things with all authority,” Ταῦτα λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἐλεγχε μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς; no specific persons are singled out, so this presumably includes everyone previously mentioned: older men, older women, younger women, younger men, and slaves); 2 Tim 4:2b (“rebuke, censure, exhort in all endurance and teaching”; again no specific person is the recipient of Timothy's actions). The verb has a range of meanings: “disgrace, put to shame, cross-examine, question, accuse, text, prove, refute, confute, correct, get the better of, expose,” LSJ, s.v. ἐλέγχω. The “rebuking” letter (ἐλεγχτική) is one of the types listed by Pseudo-Libanius, *Epist. Char.* 4, 79. Other related imperatives include: παρακάλει: 1 Tim 5:1 (here contrasted with ἐπιπλήσσειν [μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει]; Titus 2:15); παρακάλεσον: 2 Tim 4:2; and ἐπιτίμησον: 2 Tim 4:2. For a thoughtful examination of the semantic domains of some of these terms in Philo, see Troels Engberg-Pedersen, “Paraenesis Terminology in Philo,” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (eds. David E. Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen; NovTSup 106; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003: 371–392).

indicting communication would certainly fall into the category of “having authority over men” (1 Tim 2:12b). A lesser kind of teaching authority has been transferred to the older women in their capacity as *καλοδιδάσκαλοι* of the younger women (Titus 2:3), but this does not in any way contradict “Paul’s” command in 1 Tim 2:12.

In point of fact, the one approach specifically enjoined for the older women teachers in Titus 2:3–5, that of *σωφρονίζειν*, comes close to the action of “rebuking.” Preferring to translate *σωφρονίζειν* as “to correct” or “to chasten,”¹⁴ Engberg-Pedersen finds that Philo’s use of this verb is closely associated with “admonish” (*νουθετεῖν*), and that both serve as “the negative flipside of positive *παραίνεσις*.”¹⁵ This would mean that the older women are given the task of “reforming,” rather than just “reminding,” the young women, so that “to instruct in *sōphrosynē*” involves pointing out whatever misconduct needs to be changed in the young women’s behavior. In Titus 2:3–5 the Pastorals’ author posits a situation where the older women employ this method vis-à-vis the younger women, but in his view all women still ought to position themselves under the authority of the male teachers in the communities (“Let a woman learn in silence in all subordination” [1 Tim 2:11]). Even if they are treated by these men as sisters (1 Tim 5:2), the “younger women” stand on the bottom rung of the teaching ladder, so that they may receive reproof from *everyone* above them (older men, younger men, and older women).¹⁶ While the Pastoral and Pythagorean authors suppose that women as well as men will respond productively to measures of paraenesis and rebuke, the dominant gender ideology decrees that older women ought to act as teachers for young women, to supply the appropriate amounts of reminding and censure. Whatever approved teaching method is chosen—paraenesis, rebuke, serving as moral examples, and combinations of these—depends to a great extent upon the moral condition of the person(s) in the learning position.

¹⁴ “Paraenesis Terminology in Philo,” 372. But later he translates the verb as “to bring to their senses” (*ibid.*, 388). See also my translation notes on the verb in Appendix B.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 390.

¹⁶ It appears that even a young woman may dispense teaching to those beneath her: as mother to children (1 Tim 5:10b; 2 Tim 1:5; Titus 2:4) and as *despoina* over slaves (1 Tim 5:14; Titus 2:5).

ANTITHESSES AS INSTRUCTIONAL DEVICES

Like Paul, and like the authors of the Pythagorean women's letters,¹⁷ the author of the Pastorals frequently employs antithetical elements to communicate his ideas.¹⁸ The extensive use of direct opposites in the Pastorals is described by Fiore: "... antithesis found a place ... among the devices which work through the arrangement and effect of words and phrases. On a broader scale, however, the Pastorals rely on *contrasting* ideas, conduct, moral qualities, and personalities to set the proper image in focus."¹⁹ This means, as he notes about antithetical moral-immoral examples, that they "embody both the attitude promoted and the one cautioned against."²⁰ The same might be said of the oppositions between warnings and promises, and vices and virtues, in that the contrast is always meant to show the difference between a negative and a positive element. With Fiore, I understand "antithesis" as a wider category of thinking, rather than simply as a figure of speech, and I agree that the author's pedagogical assumption is that anyone who is truly interested in moral excellence will move *away* from the negative and *toward* the positive. While some research has focused on the Pastorals' contrasts of virtues and vices,²¹ as well as on their use of moral and immoral examples,²² my analysis builds on and advances this scholarship in order to consider how the antithetical components work as teaching techniques.

Form and Function of Antitheses

The structure of these antitheses suggests a condition (protasis, which is sometimes only implied), moves to a consequence (apodosis), and lastly, arrives at the "correct" conclusion: if A, then B, therefore, choose A (or

¹⁷ For example, see the antithetical credentials for a wet-nurse, as described in Chapter Three, e.g., Table A.

¹⁸ Aune includes among examples of other authors who rely on antithesis: Gorgias, *Helen*; Paul (1 Cor 8:3b; 2 Cor 3:6); other NT literature (Jn 1:3; 1Jn 2:21); Josephus, *Ant.*, 6.151; and Aelian, *Nat. an.* 2.43 (*The Westminster Dictionary*, s.v. "Antithesis"). The Pythagorean "table of opposites" (from Aristotle, *Metaphysics* I.986a, and cited in my Introduction) is an early case in point of antithetical concepts and their positive and negative moral implications.

¹⁹ *Function of Personal Example*, 20–21; my italics.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 138.

²¹ Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy*, 171–176; Malherbe, "Paraenesis in the Epistle to Titus," 304–305.

²² Fiore, *Function of Personal Example*, 195–198, 201, 205, 207–212, 218, and 225.

choose “not A”).²³ The protasis (A) and apodosis (B) of the negative side of the antithesis (consisting of a warning, vice, or immoral example) are meant to lead to a “choice” (*not* A) to avoid or to turn away from that action, which has the function of dissuasion (ὁ ἀποτρεπτικός). The protasis and apodosis of the positive side of the antithesis lead to the “choice” to adopt or turn toward that action, a form of persuasion (ὁ προτρεπτικός).

The proofs of such antitheses rely upon appeals to *ēthos*, *pathos*, or *logos*, or, more often, a combination of all three, depending on the antithesis being considered.²⁴ A reader’s choice of which side of the antithesis to accept rests on the moral character (τὸ ἦθος) of the one proposing it. If the hypothetical negative consequence is social disapproval versus a positive social esteem, the antithesis might seek to activate the passions (τὰ πάθη) of the audience, by, perhaps, inspiring fear of the negative, while generating desire for the good. The λόγος of an antithesis would often appear self-evident, given that the two sides are set in complete contradiction to each other, but human λόγος might also be buttressed by reference to other authoritative persons and literature.²⁵ Antitheses in various forms proved beneficial for many ancient orators and authors, probably because antitheses, were easy for the speaker or author to invent and remember, as well as for the audience to understand and remember.²⁶ This explains why antitheses were thought to be effective for the larger goal of instructional texts like the Pythagorean and Pastoral letters which seek to educate persons to live a virtuous life: antitheses confront the audience with a stark choice between good and bad.

²³ One such explicit antithesis appears in the Hebrew Bible: “*If* you obey the commandments of the LORD your God ... *then* you shall live and become numerous, and the LORD your God will bless you in the land that you are entering to possess. But *if* your heart turns away and you do not hear, but are led astray to bow down to other gods and serve them, I declare to you today that you shall perish; you shall not live long in the land that you are crossing the Jordan to enter and possess *Choose* life so that you and your descendants may live” Deut 30:16a, 17–18, 19b (NRSV).

²⁴ These proofs are concisely outlined by Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.3–7.

²⁵ This seems to be what Aristotle means about the use of proofs: “... to be able to grasp [these proofs], a man must be capable of logical reasoning, of studying characters and the virtues” λαβεῖν τοῦ συλλογίσασθαι δυναμένου καὶ τοῦ θεωρήσαι περὶ ἥθη καὶ τὰς ἀρετάς, *Rhet.* 1.2.7 (Freese, LCL).

²⁶ This assumption aligns with Aristotle’s statement about antithetical statements: “This kind of style is pleasing, because opposites are most intelligible and even more so when placed side by side, and also because it [antithesis] resembles a syllogism; for rebuke is a bringing together of contraries,” ἡδεῖα δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ τοιαύτη λέξις, ὅτι τάναντία γνωριμώτατα καὶ παράλληλα μάλλον γνώριμα, καὶ ὅτι ἔοικεν συλλογισμῷ· ὁ γὰρ ἐλεγχος συναγωγὴ τῶν ἀντικειμένων ἐστίν, *Rhet.* 3.9.8 (Freese, LCL, with a few changes of my own).

Warnings and Promises

The Pastorals offer several clear *warnings and promises* that function as instructional devices to persuade persons of both sexes. These antitheses fall into three areas that display the author's gender-differentiated perceptions: (1) teaching and learning the faith; (2) salvation; and (3) community reputation.

(1) As has already been discussed in the section above on the characterization of the role of learners, the author believes that the whole educational process can be either *fruit-less* or *fruit-ful*. Warnings about unproductive instruction abound in the Pastorals, as illustrated in 1 Tim 1:3–4,²⁷ where Timothy is told to command “some people not to teach differently nor to be devoted to myths and endless genealogies, which bring about speculations rather than the *oikonomia* of God in faith.”²⁸ The negative side of the antithesis is formed by “speculations” as the fruitless consequence of teaching “differently”, which is explained further as the result of being devoted to myths and endless genealogies.²⁹ In contrast, the positive result of proper teaching would be “the *oikonomia* of God in faith.” The difference is made all the more clear by the promise in the following verse, which describes “Paul’s” teaching activity: “the goal of our instruction is love, from a clean heart and a good conscience and an un-hypocritical faith.”³⁰ Thus, the waste products of the

²⁷ One lengthy antithetical pattern of right and wrong education is found in 2 Timothy 3:1–4:5, where some opponents’ teaching as well as the learnings of “frivolous women” are to be wholly avoided (καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου, 2 Tim 3:5b). On the other side, Paul, along with the Scriptures, ought to be emulated (2 Tim 3:14–15).

²⁸ μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, αἵτινες ἐκζητήσεις παρέχουσιν μάλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει. I allow *οἰκονομία* to remain as transliterated in order to illustrate the importance of household terms in the Pastorals.

²⁹ The teachings ascribed to the opponents are further labeled as “teachings of demons” (διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, 1 Tim 4:1b); “profane and old womanly myths” 1 Tim 4:7); “profane empty talk and contradictions of falsely-named knowledge” (τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, 1 Tim 6:20). “Profane empty talk” is rejected again in 2 Tim 2:16, because “they will advance impiety even more, and their speech will spread like gangrene” (ἐπὶ πλεῖον γὰρ προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἔξει, 2 Tim 2:16b–17). The one who teaches “differently” is castigated as “being puffed up, knowing nothing, but being sick about debates and word-battles, from which come envy, strife, blasphemy, evil suspicions, constant irritations of men ruined in mind and deprived of the truth, thinking piety to be a means of gain,” τετύφωται, μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ ᾧ γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημία, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί, διαπαρατριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας, νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν, 1 Tim 6:4–5.

³⁰ τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ

pre-occupation with myths and genealogies are disputations (ἐκζητήσεις) and foolish teachings (ματαιολογία), while the desirable product (τὸ τέλος) of Paul's instruction is a very positive ἀγάπη. The potential for a negative consequence for "certain persons" is then described quite vividly: "By departing from these things, certain persons turned away toward foolish talk, wishing to be teachers of the law, even though they did not understand either what they are saying or what they insist upon."³¹ The warning thus discourages the audience, both male and female, on three points: from teaching differently (than Paul); from obsessions with myths (some of them "old womanly") and endless genealogies, which lead to disputations and foolish teachings, and ultimately from people (again, both men and women) who turn away, talk foolishly, and totally lack understanding of even their own speech. On the other side of the antithesis stands the promise offered by the teaching of Paul: the *oikonomia* of God in faith, with its ethical practices of love from a clean heart and a good conscience and an un-hypocritical faith (1 Tim 1:4–5). These are the promised rewards for all believers who attend to Paul's instruction, especially as it is presented and interpreted in the Pastorals themselves.

(2) Correct and incorrect education have ultimate consequences which the author delineates as "salvation" on the promise side, and "turning away," or falling into the camp of Satan on the warning side. Potentially, both women and men may benefit from the positive consequences, or be subject to the negative ones. "Certain men" (and perhaps some women) in 1 Tim 1:6–7, as well as "certain" younger widows have turned away (1 Tim 5:13, 15).³² Some of

πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου, 1 Tim 1:5. Karris points out that the antithesis is not just between Paul's teachings and the opponents' teaching, but between Paul and the opponents as teachers: "... it is the author's desire to show that he alone has the right to and actually does impart the truth, that he and his disciples alone have the power to teach correctly. Furthermore ... the author wants to cause aversion for his opponents in the minds of his readers and to establish a strong alternative to their view of Pauline tradition" ("The Background and Significance of the Polemic," 563–564).

³¹ ὡν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν, θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσιν μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαίουνται, 1 Tim 1:6–7.

³² The already-achieved consequence in 1 Tim 5:15 (ἢ ὅτι τινες ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ) parallels the statement from 1:6–7 (ὡν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν, θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι). Other instances of "wandering" include: "some people who will go away from the faith," ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, 1 Tim 4:1b; "some people longing for [wealth] wandered away from the faith," τινες ὀρεγόμενοι ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως, 1 Tim 6:10b; "Hymenaeus and Philetus, who deviated [ἡστόχησαν] from the truth, saying that the resurrection has already happened," 2 Tim 2:15; those will "will turn away [ἀποστρέψουσιν] from the truth of the report and they will turn toward [ἐκτραπήσονται] myths," 2 Tim 4:4; and even Paul admits to once being among those who were "led astray," πλανώμε-

these younger widows have already turned toward Satan, to whom “Paul” has also consigned Hymenaeus and Alexander.³³ The warnings about deviating from the correct path are often linked to “improper” speaking performed by both men and women. For instance, 1 Tim 1:7b indicts the opponents (all men? or men and women?) for not understanding “either what they are saying or what they insist upon,” which is the very definition of what he calls their ματαιολογία (1 Tim 1:6). The already-cited 1 Tim 5:13b describes morally wrong speech by the younger widows. Of course, in the Pastorals “speaking” is frequently understood as “teaching,” so that “turning away from the faith” is the ultimate negative outcome of the incorrect instructional process of the opponents. Here we might remember the gender-based differentiation about learning: since women have been commanded to learn in silence, any speaking at all on their part might be construed as wrong teaching, whereas at least some men are allowed to teach, but they must be careful to teach only the authorized Pauline content, rather than to “teach differently” (ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 1 Tim 1:3; 6:3).

The author of the Pastorals promises “salvation” (σωτηρία) for both men and women as the good outcome for their correct thinking and behavior.³⁴ Paul himself anticipates future benefits based upon his faithful vocation: “The Lord will rescue me from every evil work and he will save [σώσει] me for his heavenly kingdom”³⁵ God’s salvation is extended to unnamed (male and female) persons: “For the grace of God appeared for salvation for all people” (Titus 2:11).³⁶ However, there exist some gender distinctions

νοι, Titus 3:3. To these we might appropriately add all those who turned away [ἀπεστράφησάν] from Paul in Asia, including Phygelus and Hermogenes; Demas, who abandoned [ἐγκατέλιπεν] Paul (2 Tim 4:10a); and the “all” who at his first *apologia* also abandoned [ἐγκατέλιπον] Paul (2 Tim 4:16).

³³ Two other pertinent references are: 1 Tim 3:7b, which warns that a man who desires the office of bishop ought to beware lest “he fall into reproach and the snare of the *diabolos*”; and 2 Tim 2:26, which foresees that some opponents “might become sober again from the snare of the *diabolos*,” ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος.

³⁴ These promised positive rewards for faithful believers are antithetical to the dire consequences not so much in syntax or arrangement as in contrasting thoughts.

³⁵ ῥύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον, 2 Tim 4:18.

³⁶ Cf. 1 Tim 1:15; 2:4; 2 Tim 1:9; 2:10; Titus 3:5. Twice God’s “saving” is in the past tense (2 Tim 1:9; Titus 3:5), but, in general, the author perceives “eternal life” as coming in the future (1 Tim 1:16; 4:8; 6:18–19; Titus 1:2; 3:7). The author’s knowledge of Pauline eschatology is manifested in references to “later times” (1 Tim 4:1); “last days” (2 Tim 3:1); Christ as judge (2 Tim 4:1, 8); “the Day” (2 Tim 1:12, 18; 4:8); and a “heavenly kingdom” (2 Tim 4:18). “The epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Tim 6:14; 2 Tim 4:1, 8; Titus 2:13) may have been taken from 2 Thess 2:8 “at the epiphany of his coming,” τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ.

in what activities will lead to this salvation. For example, 1Tim 2:15 foresees salvation will occur for women under certain female conditions: "But she will be saved through childbearing, if they remain in faith and in love and in holiness with moderation."³⁷ This "sure saying" (πιστός ὁ λόγος) ties *eternal* salvation for Christian women to their bodily functions in *this* life, and the author wields the promise in order to win over any women who might be declining to marry and have children.³⁸ This potential reward for female believers is comparable to the promise in 1Tim 4:16: "Take pains for yourself [Timothy] and your teaching; continue in them, for by doing this you will save both yourself and those who hear you."³⁹ Since women have already been disallowed from any teaching office, that route to salvation is closed to them.⁴⁰ The same kind of future divine salvation is presented to both men and women, but the present actions that will effect it remain differentiated by sex. Still, the rhetorical-instructional method of pointing out negative and positive consequences is applicable for all believers.

³⁷ The switch from third-person singular (σωθήσεται) to the third person plural (μείνωσιν) has been variously explained (cf. Bassler, *1 Timothy*, *2 Timothy*, *Titus*, 61). Both Wagener and Merz link this verse to the author's use of Eve (vv. 13–14) as the primal representative of (easily deceived) female persons. Wagener understands that the author extends the reference to "Eve" in the σωθήσεται, then moving to the women in his audience in the μείνωσιν (*Die Ordnung*, 107). She concludes, "Die Rettungsaussage ist gar nicht auf Eva, sondern lediglich auf die angesprochenen Frauen in der Gemeindesituation des 1Tim zu beziehen ..." (ibid., 108). Or as Merz states: "... Die Frau muss zunächst (wie Eva) Kinder gebären und zugleich anders als Eva bei der wahren Lehre und dem ihr entsprechenden Verhalten bleiben" (*Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 302).

³⁸ For delineations of the boundaries of this passage, explaining why 1Tim 3:1a is to be connected to 2:15, see Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 70–71, 109; and Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 271, 358, 372–375.

³⁹ ἔπρεξε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ· ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν καὶ σεαυτὸν σώσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου. By comparisons to two other promises of salvation, Merz has cogently argued for a very "literal" reading of this verse, calling the author's idea a "soteriologischer Sonderweg" for women (*Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 296). She reviews and rejects the many scholarly attempts to "soften" or make some more acceptable theological sense of this claim (ibid., 288–298).

⁴⁰ Merz stresses the links made by the Pastorals between "good works" and "salvation," pointing out that since only men can aspire to the "good work" of *episkopos* (1Tim 3:1b), women are likewise prohibited from this way to obtain salvation (ibid., 288–291). She argues that women's disqualification from teaching office(s) prompts the author to put forward for women this special gender-based way of salvation: "... verpflichtet v. 15a Frauen auf die Mutterschaft als heilnotwendiges Werk und bietet damit eine soteriologische Alternative zum ihnen verbotenen Lehren im Gottesdienst, das männlichen Amtsträgern vorbehalten bleibt" (ibid., 303).

(3) A third set of warnings and promises relates to the reputation of the community in a larger social context.⁴¹ The outcomes depend on the conduct of both men and women,⁴² with the salutary results being stated in

⁴¹ This Christian author is not alone in laying the burden of responsibility for the community's reputation upon good conduct by its members. Balch convincingly argues that "the author of 1 Peter exhorted the recipients of his letter to the behavior outlined in the code with the intention of encouraging conduct which would contradict the Roman slanders. Such behavior would have been demanded not only by pagan masters and husbands but also by the aristocratic Roman 'governors' mentioned in 1 Pet 2:14" (*Let Wives Be Submissive*, 119). In this way, the use of the household code "has an apologetic function in the historical context; the paraenesis is given in light of outside criticism" (ibid., 109). Seeing a similar situation surrounding at least Titus 2:4–5, Quinn suggests that: "... the relation of wife to husband was the object of some particularly searching criticism that merited emphatic reply [In part this criticism came] from pagan Roman contemporaries who were chronically allergic to Eastern cults and their novel customs ..." (*Letter to Titus*, 138). Marshall agrees with this general context: "The interest in the reaction of outsiders (cf. [Titus] 2:8, 10; 1 Tim 3:6–7; 1 Tim 6:1) and the positive motivation of 2:10 suggest that some degree of apologetic-missionary interest may be in view ..." (*The Pastoral Epistles*, 250). M.Y. MacDonald arrives at a less definitive conclusion: "The way these texts [the Pastorals] focus on the public sphere may be a response to pagan accusations of secretive activity, a response which aims to quiet pagan attack. Yet, the public emphasis may also be a response to an internal problem" (*Early Christian Women*, 62–63). MacDonald makes the cogent observation that: "In the case of the Pastoral Epistles it seems that what outsiders are saying about early Christian women is being internalized and transformed into a teaching about the behaviour of women" (ibid., 159; cf. also, 63).

Towner states explicitly: "The fear is that unbelievers might trace the unconventional (and especially promiscuous) behavior of young women to the Christian gospel they have embraced and the God in whom this message originated" (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 728–729). Some of Towner's statements are based on the ill-advised approach of Bruce W. Winter, who uses the neologism "New Woman" to describe certain Roman women (*Roman Wives*). The term itself comes from an excursus by Elaine Fantham titled "The 'New Woman': Representation and Reality" (*Women in the Classical World*). She states: "... a new kind of woman appears precisely at the time of Cicero and Caesar: a woman in high position, who nevertheless claims for herself the indulgence in sexuality of a woman of pleasure. The theme of this chapter is this new pattern of female behavior and its influence on the celebration of love and submission to women in Roman poetry between the time of Catullus (85?–54 BCE) and Ovid (43 BCE–17 CE)" (ibid., 280–281). It is clear that the editors are not ascribing this depiction of the "new woman" to any and all women in the Roman world: they are examining love texts, so that they easily concede "We shall never know to what extent women of established family endorsed the life of pleasure described by the elegists [With the advent of Augustan legislation] [o]rdinary anonymous citizens might continue to be chaste or promiscuous unnoticed, but respectability was not enforced on those in the public eye" (ibid., 290). Winter appears to have applied their limited term and literary analysis to women of various statuses and geographic areas, and ignores the "representation" aspect of the original investigation. Furthermore, I seriously question how many women there could have been in Pauline communities whose lives "beyond their household could involve illicit liaisons that defied the previously accepted norms of marriage fidelity and chastity" (*Roman Wives*, 5).

⁴² The behavior of slaves (presumably both male and female) also affects the social

terms of what negative outcomes will not happen. With respect to men in the community, for instance, 1 Tim 3:7 concludes the list of requirements for a man who wants to be bishop with: “It is necessary [for a bishop] to have a good witness from those outside, so that he might not fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.”⁴³ Titus himself can obtain a good reputation for the assemblies on Crete, according to the direction that he ought to act as a role model for the “younger men”: “The younger men likewise exhort to be *sōphrōn*, by offering yourself in all respects as an example of good works, being sound in the teaching, [having] dignity, beyond reproach in the healthy teaching, so that the opponent might be put to shame, having nothing base to say about us.” The promise of these positive outcomes to Christian men who behave properly is not postponed until after death; rather, they will result in immediate benefits for the community.

As I have demonstrated in the previous chapter, the author conveys much disquiet about potentially unproductive learning by young women, and here his anxiety expands even further so that proper feminine behavior becomes a noteworthy component of the reputation of the whole community. In 1 Tim 5:14, the younger widows are commanded to marry, to bear children, to manage their households in order “to give no opportunity to the opponent for reproach.” This confounding of the opponent is meant to come close on the heels of the younger widows’ obedience to “Paul’s” instructions. A second caution related to younger women is clearly seen in Titus 2:4–5, where older women are to instruct the younger ones in moderation,

standing of the assembly, as seen in 1 Tim 6:1, “whoever are slaves under a yoke, let them consider their own masters as worthy of all honor, so that the name of God and the teaching might not be blasphemed,” “Ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότης πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους ἡγείσθωσαν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βλασφημῇται. This sentiment occurs also in Titus 2:9–10.

⁴³ Here public reproach (reviling, disgrace, insult, ὁ ὀνειδισμός) is coupled with ὁ διάβολος (the adversary, one who slanders). “Slandering” is also mentioned as a general practice to be avoided by women in 1 Tim 3:11, for female deacons (or wives of deacons); and in Titus 2:3 for the “older women.” Connecting “slander” with “blasphemy,” 2 Tim 3:2–3 cites “men” (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) who will be both “blasphemers” (βλάσφημοι) as well as “slanderers” (διάβολοι) in the last days. Thus these speech-terms—ὁ ὀνειδισμός, ὁ διάβολος, οἱ βλάσφημοι and their cognates—are linked with terms that signal the opponents or opposition in general: ἀντίκειμαι, ἐναντίος, as well as ὁ Σατανᾶς (who is connect to blaspheming in 1 Tim 1:20); and with verbal abuse (λοιδορία) in 1 Tim 5:14–15. As another linguistic indication that the Pastorals may be read as the compositions of a single author who is not Paul, βλασφ-cognates occur often (1 Tim 1:13, 20; 6:1, 4; 2 Tim 3:2; Titus 2:5; 3:2), whereas the noun βλασφημία and adjective βλάσφημος never appear in the other Paulines, and the verb βλασφημεῖν is used there rarely (Rom 2:24; 3:8; 14:16; 1 Cor 10:30; cited in Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 122–123; BDAG, s.v. βλασφημέω).

etc., “so that the word of God might not be blasphemed.” Whether or not women (and others) are bringing the *ekklēsia* into disrepute by some socially shocking activities, if they will only conform to moral standards they will instigate the practical reward of honor for their community and for God.

To summarize, warnings and promises are directed to women as well as men in the Pastoral Letters, showing that the author considers both sexes to be susceptible to this antithetical means of persuasion. While the most negative consequences are envisioned more often for “Paul’s” opponents, there is still much tension expressed about community members teaching or learning incorrectly (and thus missing out on salvation by turning away from the faith), as well as concern for the community’s reputation with non-believers. The author assumes that female believers might experience any and all of these future scenarios, both good and bad, and that they might be moved by the same kinds of antithetical claims that would prompt the men to avoid or adopt certain behaviors.

Vices and Virtues

The Pastoral Letters make copious use of contrasting *vices and virtues*, the content and form of which draw upon other Pauline letters as well as other Christian and general philosophical sources. Commenting that the virtue and vice lists in the Pastorals are “obvious,” Fiore elaborates: “these lists often find themselves applied to various segments of the community with a particular notice or other to make them applicable to that group.”⁴⁴ Some examples demonstrate in what ways the author uses listings of virtue and vices for both women and men.

(1) In the form of instructional content: For instance, lists directed at people of both sexes are found in Titus 2:2–10. This straightforward communication mostly stresses ways each social group ought to behave, with only a few “vices” (some as negated virtues) identified: the older women are not to be slanderers or “tipplers” (μὴ διαβόλους μηδὲ οἶνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένas), while slaves are not to talk back (μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας), nor to “misappropriate” (μὴ νοσφιζομένους). By dividing people into these five groups, the author implies that these instructions cover everyone in the “household of God.”

⁴⁴ *Function of Personal Example*, 17, and n. 45, in which he cites 1 Tim 2:1–15; 3:11; 5:5–8, 16; 6:17–19; Titus 2:2–6, 9; 3:1–2. Fiore also briefly mentions virtues and vices in the discourses of Isocrates (53), Plutarch (73–74), the Socratic Epistles (133–134, and 133 n. 133), and in Paul’s letters (187–188).

(2) In indictments of opponents: In 2 Timothy, the author avers that an eschatological time is coming (3:1b) when “men” (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) will be:

lovers of self, lovers of money, boasters, arrogant, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, unloving, irreconcilable, slanderers, uncontrolled, untamed, not interested in the common good, betrayers, reckless, puffed up, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having a form of piety but denying the power of it.⁴⁵

In twenty-nine words, the author builds his vice list to a crescendo, using four combinations of φιλ- with the objects of love to form an inclusio: self (φιλαυτοί) and money (φιλάργυροι), and ending with pleasure (φιλήδονοι) contrasted with the fourth term, which is virtuous love for God (φιλόθεοι). Many of the problematic issues taken up by the Pastorals in other places are present in this list: handling wealth, household relationships, proper speech, the communal good, control of the emotions, sincere piety.⁴⁶ A summary statement charges those who exhibit such vices with “having a form of piety but denying the power of it.”⁴⁷

Immediately after this vice list, the author’s persistent discourse about women arises, since the very (male?) opponents⁴⁸ censured by means of this list are depicted as having an inappropriate relationship to some women (γυναίκαρια): “For among these [men] are those who enter houses and capture frivolous women who are filled with sins, being led by various desires, always learning and never able to come to a knowledge of truth” (2 Tim 3:6–7).⁴⁹ Here, rather than being listed as single, asyndetic terms, the vices of

⁴⁵ φιλαυτοί, φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεύσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδόται, προπετεῖς, τετυφωμένοι, φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἡρνημένοι, 2 Tim 3:2–5a.

⁴⁶ As a further example, being ἀχάριστοι may be contrasted with 1 Tim 2:1: “I urge then first of all entreaties, prayers, petitions, *thanksgivings*, be made on behalf of all people,” Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων ποιῆσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων; and 4:4: “And nothing is rejected when received with *thanksgiving*,” καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον.

⁴⁷ Does the author mean to say that they deny the power of *true* piety? Or that there is something inherent in this *false* (empty) piety that has a negative power over its practitioners?

⁴⁸ It seems likely to me that the author thinks of these opponents as men, given that the vice list is juxtaposed with the activity of “capturing frivolous women.” However, from the author’s viewpoint, there are also some women going about from house to house in inappropriate fashion (or at least, the threat of this occurrence) in 1 Tim 5:13.

⁴⁹ This “entering” houses brings to mind Origen’s report of Celsus’ comment that: “Indeed, *throughout private houses*, we see also wool-workers and shoemakers and fullers and the most

the “frivolous women” are conveyed by four participles: σεσωρευμένα ... ἀγόμενα ... μανθάνοντα ... [μηδέποτε] δυνάμενα.⁵⁰ Certainly, the author intends for his audience to view these women with distaste, and for female readers to cease and desist any activities in these categories so that they might separate themselves from the unfavorable stereotypes.

Along with these “frivolous women” who are far away from the truth, the younger widows in 1 Timothy 5 are also marked by vices, and moving, literally, in the wrong direction:

for when they feel sensuous impulses that alienate them from Christ, they wish to marry, incurring judgment because they nullified the first vow. At the same time they are learning unproductively, going around from house to house, and not only being unproductive, but also gossips and busybodies, saying things that should not be [said].

As in 2Tim 3:6–7, the syntax is again more complicated than a simple list, beginning with a conditional sentence (ὅταν γὰρ καταστρηνιάσωσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμῇν θέλουσιν), followed by a participial clause (ἔχουσαι κρίμα) and a dependent clause (ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν). While the three terms ἀργαὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ φλύαροι καὶ περίεργοι have a parallel construction, they are subsequently linked to a participial phrase that explains what these unproductive learners, gossips, and busybodies are really doing with their time: λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα. All in all, such vices are set in opposition to the author’s moral solution for correcting such behavior: βούλομαι οὖν νεωτέρας γαμῇν, τεκνογονεῖν, οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν. The trio of virtuous actions—to marry, to bear children, to manage a household—forms its own short asyndetic list, this time in the

uneducated and most boorish people, who in the presence of their elder and wiser masters would dare to say nothing, but when they take mere children, and *some ignorant women* with them, *in private* recount astonishing things in detail,” Ὁρώμεν δὴ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας οἰκίας ἐριουργοὺς καὶ σκυτοτόμους καὶ κναφεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀπαιδευτοτάτους τε καὶ ἀγροικοτάτους ἐναντίον μὲν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ φρονιμωτέρων δεσποτῶν οὐδὲν φθέγγεσθαι τολμώντας, ἐπειδὴν δὲ τῶν παιδῶν αὐτῶν ἰδίᾳ λάβωνται καὶ γυναικῶν τινῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀνοήτων, θαυμάσι ἅττα διεξιόντας, *Contra. Celsus* 3.55.

⁵⁰ The fact that the first two of these are in the middle-passive voice emphasizes the weakness of the female subjects, while the third, μανθάνειν, also explicitly places women in a recipient-position; the opinion that women lack moral power is summed up in the phrase μηδέποτε δυνάμενα. The sex-specific failings of these women correlate with the author’s understanding that female nature is more susceptible to sin and (sexual) desire, as shown in his concise interpretation of the Genesis account of Eve’s temptation in 1Tim 2:14. The author offers one, and only one, solution to restrain women from such immoral behavior: subordination (ὑποταγή, 1Tim 2:11), especially subordination to their own husbands (Titus 2:5).

form of infinitives that, with the addition of βούλομαι, have the force of imperative commands coming from Paul himself.

(3) In requirements for church office: As formulated, the several inventories of virtues and vices for church office-holders allow for an evaluation of a person's moral fitness for the office and also stand as ideals for non-officials to emulate. For instance, the lengthy list of requirements for men in the office of bishop in 1Tim 3:2–7 contains many of the same virtues (sober, *sōphrōn*, etc) and vices (bully, quarrelsome, etc.) that are listed elsewhere for other members of the community. Nearly all the virtues (and negated vices)⁵¹ in this list of requirements for choosing bishops are also applied elsewhere to both men and women as organized in Table B below. The elements of women's virtues appear in italics.

Table C: Virtues and Vices.

List for Episkopos

1 Tim 3:2–7	Other Occurrences	To Whom Also Applied
<i>irreproachable</i> (ἀνεπιλημπτος)	1 Tim 5:7	<i>“real widows”</i>
<i>husband of one wife</i> (μιάς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα)	1 Tim 3:12 Titus 1:6 1 Tim 5:9 (<i>wife of one husband</i>)	male deacons male elders <i>enrolled widows</i>
<i>sober</i> (νηφάλιος)	1 Tim 3:11 Titus 1:7 Titus 2:2	<i>female deacons/deacons' wives</i> male elders older men
<i>moderate</i> (σώφρων)	1 Tim 2:9, 15 2 Tim 1:7 Titus 1:8 Titus 2:2 Titus 2:4 Titus 2:5 Titus 2:6 Titus 2:12	<i>women</i> “us” (presumably everyone) male elders older men <i>older women</i> <i>younger women</i> younger men everyone
<i>decorous</i> (κόσμιος)	1 Tim 2:9	<i>women</i>

⁵¹ Here again the virtues appear with vices that have been modified by negatives (alpha-privatives and μή).

List for Episkopos

1 Tim 3:2–7	Other Occurrences	To Whom Also Applied
<i>hospitable</i> (φιλόξενος)	Titus 1:8 1 Tim 5:10 (ἐξενδοχέω)	male elders <i>enrolled widows</i>
<i>skilled at teaching</i> (διδακτικός)	2 Tim 2:24	servant of God (Timothy)
<i>not addicted to wine</i> (μὴ πάροινος)	Titus 1:7 Titus 2:3 (μὴ δὲ οἴνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας) 1 Tim 3:8 (μὴ οἴνω πολλῷ προσέχοντας)	male elders <i>older women</i> male deacons
<i>not a bully</i> (μὴ πλήκτης)	Titus 1:7	male elders
<i>tolerant</i> (ἐπιεικής)	Titus 3:2	everyone
<i>not quarrelsome</i> (ἄμαχος) (cf. also 2 Tim 2:23, 24; Titus 3:9)	Titus 3:2	everyone
<i>not a lover of money</i> (ἀφιλάργυρος) (cf. also 1 Tim 3:8)	Titus 6:10 (2 Tim 3:2)	all the wealthy (opponents)
<i>presiding over household</i> (τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον)	1 Tim 3:12 1 Tim 5:14 (οἰκοδεσποτεῖν) Titus 2:5 (οἰκουργούς)	male deacons <i>younger widows</i> <i>younger women</i>

Even though some of the virtuous activities for women are the same as or similar to those required for men: e.g., praying (1 Tim 2:8; 5:5); hospitality (1 Tim 3:2; 5:10); providing for one's household (1 Tim 3:4; 5:4, 8, 16), in many of these cases there is an explicit gender-based difference in how these virtues are to be displayed. Every Christian in the letters' audience is "to be zealous for good works" (ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων, Titus 2:14), but whether one is male or female determines the range of "good works" one ought to seek after and possibly attain. The word διδακτικός, "skilled at teaching," is found only in the list for a bishop (1 Tim 3:2) and for Timothy himself (2 Tim 2:24–25). This is additional evidence that the activity of teaching is a masculine attribute, and, at that, one that is restricted to the highest male office-holders in the communities: bishops, Timothy, and, of course, Paul (1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11). Therefore, it should come as no surprise to the reader of the Pastorals that women are specifically prohibited from teaching.

In 1 Timothy 3:11, we encounter a verse that presents special interpretive difficulties when analyzing the Pastorals' vices and virtues related to women and church office: "Likewise [it is necessary] for women [γυναῖκας] to be dignified, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things."⁵² Scholars have debated whether the word "women" here refers to female deacons or rather to the wives of the male deacons addressed by vv. 8–10 and again in vv. 12–13.⁵³ That the author is laying out requirements for women serving as deacons is supported by the parallel construction of the list for male deacons in vv. 8–9 alongside the shorter list in v. 11. Both first use the adjective σεμνός, then critique improper speech (δῖλος; διάβολος; both of which begin with the same sound),⁵⁴ followed by a reference to intoxication/sobriety (μὴ οἶνον πολλῷ προσέχοντας; νηφαλίους), and end with a phrase about faithfulness. (The men are also not to be αἰσχροκερδεῖς, which has no counterpart in the women's qualifications.) On the other hand, the expectations for male deacons continue again in vv. 12–13, implying that v. 11 is meant for their wives, especially since the men are immediately presented with the command to be the husband of one wife (v. 12). Also to be noted is that one female deacon is mentioned in the authentic Paulines: "I recommend to you Phoebe our sister, who is also a deacon of the assembly in Cenchreae."⁵⁵ However, that she is not named in the Pastorals increases the likelihood that the author thinks of these women as the wives of deacons.

As can be seen when reading the various teachings for and about women in the Pastorals, the author consistently places women in the context of a household. This preponderance of evidence strongly advises that "wife/wives," rather than "woman/women," might be even more accurate English translations of γυνή/γυναῖκες wherever they occur in the Pastorals. The evi-

⁵² γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς, μὴ διαβόλους, νηφαλίους, πιστάς ἐν πάσιν.

⁵³ The category of women being referred to must have been evident to the author and his earliest readers. See Bassler for a summary of the discussion on these women (1 Timothy, 70–71). See also Bjelland Kartzow's more recent analysis of the verse, *Gossip and Gender*, 133–137. Bjelland Kartzow remains uncommitted as to the firm identity of these women, referring to them as "women related to deacons," *ibid.*, 135. Eventually an order of "deaconesses" did develop, and these women prepared female candidates for baptism, as attested in the *Didaskalia* and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place*, 92). Bjelland Kartzow notes that feminine terms for female deacons are not found until the fourth century, *Gossip and Gender*, 134.

⁵⁴ The warning against the vice of slander in women is repeated in Titus 2:3, and is cast as one vice of the opponents in 2 Tim 3:3. On women as slanderers, see Bjelland Kartzow, *Gossip and Gender*, 133–137; on the slander as a feminizing attribute of the opponents, see *ibid.*, 197–199, 205.

⁵⁵ Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν καὶ διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, Rom 16:1.

dence might also assist in interpreting the apparently anomalous mention of “women” here in 1Tim 3:11, which occurs in the middle of the list of requirements for deacons. It certainly suggests that this reference is to the wives of the deacons, rather than to female deacons. If they are deacons’ wives, then as prominent women, they would be visible to serve as moral examples for other women in the assemblies. Or, if a wife’s behavior is not exemplary, then her husband would not be considered leadership material.⁵⁶ Alternatively, even if the author meant to establish standards for female deacons, the word *γυναῖκες* would still allude to their being *married* women. Since in this passage, as in others, the traditional structure of the Roman household has been fused with the functions of the house-church, the domestic roles become significant indicators of the activities considered appropriate for individuals in the household of God. In any case, either as female deacons *or* as wives of deacons, these women are expected to adhere to the customary forms of the virtues, while strictly avoiding the usually identified vices.

Immoral and Moral Examples

A third antithetical instructional method that appears in the Pastorals is the use of *immoral and moral examples*,⁵⁷ which are embedded in various literary forms. Fiore comments on the antithetical nature of these examples:

From the theoretical treatises on example one expects a variety of examples: from the past or present, named individuals or members of a class or type, historical persons or fictitious and hypothetical figures *Comparison and contrast are achieved through antithetical examples*. Examples are closely associated with metaphors and other analogies and are accompanied by apposite sayings and statements.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ In the opinion of the author, a man could be rejected as a leader based on the behavior of his household, including his children, 1Tim 3:4–5; Titus 1:6.

⁵⁷ Others have noted the use of examples as an element of paraenetic texts: Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, 23; Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 52.

⁵⁸ *Function of Personal Example*, 191; my italics. Fiore also notes that “... the examples, as varied as they are in the Pastorals, are often simple sketches, elaborated in conjunction with *virtue and vice* lists and with precepts” (ibid., 224; my italics). Commenting on “Discourses to Young Officials and Kingship Treatises,” Fiore lists several formal features related to examples: (1) the juxtaposition of contrasting examples of teachers and audiences; (2) other antithetical examples in admonitions; (3) examples within individual prescriptions to teach by actions along with words; (4) a sketched-out rather than detailed description of the examples, as in vice and virtue lists; (5) epistolary characteristics, such as the relationship between writer and recipient; (6) examples used alone or with prescriptions; and (7) “a wide range of hortatory devices surrounds the examples in all these works” (ibid., 192).

What makes any of the examples (whether linked with other antithetical elements or not) “educational” is that they function as standards by which the audience members may assess their own behavior.⁵⁹ In appealing to the emotions of the audience, the immoral examples serve to repulse the reader students, while the moral examples are meant to attract them. This dualistic function of dissuasion-persuasion is similar to the function of examples determined by Mitchell for deliberative speeches and letters, “wherein the author brings to mind a past person or situation and either says that the course of action proposed, like the example, will be advantageous, or, in the negative, that the proposed action will, like the example, bring ruin and despair.”⁶⁰ Her description of the function of examples in deliberation highlights their antithetical nature, while also suggesting that the reason to choose the positive over the negative is related to the benefits of the promised favorable consequences compared with the disadvantage of the warnings of ill-fated consequences.⁶¹ In this way, the “carrot and stick” rhetorical approach of outlining contrasting examples acts as a teaching method for both women and men in the Pastorals.

I have already demonstrated that, in most respects, the Pastorals do not offer Paul, Timothy, Titus, or the (other) male office-holders as examples for women to follow in the specifics of their daily lives, so that the best role models for the female readers of the Pastorals are the older women called “good teachers” in Titus 2:3. Yet the author does put forward additional named individuals and other groups of moral (and immoral) women who may serve as examples for women in his assemblies.⁶² When the audience

⁵⁹ Fiore speculates on how the examples were intended to be appropriated: “... a variety of individuals exercise paradigmatic roles and the implicit example used in the letters requires the audience’s attention, reaction, and commitment to details of attitude and conduct outside the explicit example sections” (ibid., 227–228).

⁶⁰ *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 40. She reiterates that examples possess “a particular suitability for deliberations It is not merely the use of παραδείγματα that sets deliberative rhetoric apart, but the special function which they perform in the argumentation of this rhetorical species ...” (ibid., 40, n. 94; her italics).

⁶¹ Unlike in true deliberative speeches, where particular situations confront a decision-making body, in paraenetic letters like the Pastorals, the positive and negative examples give few hints as to their actual historical context. This does not mean, however, that the author has not carefully chosen these examples with specific audiences and occasions in mind.

⁶² Fiore does not separately consider the use of examples for women in the Pastorals’ communities, but he does draw on Titus 2:3–5 at one point: “The letter to Titus connects the conduct of various members of the community with the way the Christian message is received. The example of the teaching in action demonstrates its acceptability in theory. So, young women are to be schooled in domestic virtues ...” (*Function of Personal Example*, 212).

of the Pastorals reads over the shoulders of Timothy and Titus, they already know that whatever few women are named or singled out in the letters are no longer alive. Thus, the first, and all subsequent, readers of these pseudonymous letters would have to make an imaginative leap from their knowledge of the female examples (from history or literature) offered in the Pastorals to their own lives and times, even looking toward women in their communities and experience who might model the virtuous feminine behavior prescribed in the letters.⁶³ In this fashion, the female examples incorporated in the letters as instructional devices do not simply remain on the page, but come to life in the historical reality of later Christ-believing women.

1. *Scriptural Example: Eve*

The figure of Eve, the “first woman,” operates as a justification for the command that women should not teach or have authority (1Tim 2:11–15). Eve functions as a negative example in this passage based on two details of the narrative in Genesis 2–3: she was created second after Adam, and then responded differently (and wrongly) to the serpent’s deception. What the author of the Pastorals claims is that something about the physical nature of Eve prohibits her “daughters” from taking on teaching and leadership roles in the communities. Therefore, her creation in a secondary stage reveals something about her female essence and the resultant (lesser) capacity to make moral decisions.⁶⁴ Once the reasoning is followed through completely, the reader sees that, by presenting Mother Eve as a negative example, the ways in which she or any of her female offspring can become more virtuous are limited because of their God-created nature as women. The author believes that women are not only *likely* to act immorally in certain situations (specifically, teaching and having authority over men), but they are *destined* to act like this due to their biology. Thus, the first remedy for Eve’s women

⁶³ That the author includes lists of requirements for either female deacons, or deacons’ wives (1Tim 3:11), suggests that some women would have had some visibility within the author’s communities, even if only as the spouses of male officials, and that the author expects their good behavior to function as “ideal” feminine conduct. As I note in my translation, the interpretive difficulty is that the Pastorals’ author inserts this verse about women in the middle of his instructions for “deacons.” Whether the women of 1Tim 3:11 are female deacons or deacons’ wives, he must have thought it necessary for these women to have some specific instructions.

⁶⁴ Merz discusses and provides references for the prevalent belief in the weakened moral capacity of Eve, and thus, of every woman, found in early Christian and Jewish literature (*Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 345–346). See also Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 105–106.

is to remain in silent subordination, in order to prevent the possibility of deception, while the second is to take up the woman's role as childbearer (1 Tim 2:15). Whatever the theological meaning of this statement with regard to the salvation of women, it is clear here, and throughout the Pastorals, that a woman's virtue depends on fulfilling her "natural" woman-ness, and that her choices of action are now concentrated on the childbearing function.⁶⁵ In this way, Christian women will be able to avoid the immoral conduct of "the woman" (ἡ γυνή) even if they cannot put off her female body; the example of Eve is expected to constrain the behavior of female members of the author's audience. Of course, this text influences male readers as well: they could (and did) use this instruction from the letter as justification for prohibiting women from community offices.

2. Examples of Unnamed Widows

It is a characteristic of several New Testament texts to mention the marital, economic, and even spiritual situation of widows, and this attention to the presence and sometimes financial plight of widows persists in other early Christian literature.⁶⁶ Paul refers to widows in 1 Cor 7:8–9 and implicitly in 7:39–40, but there is nothing that suggests an "office" of widows there, and the same is true of several other NT mentions of widows (e.g., Mk 12:40, 42; Lk 2:36–38; Acts 6:1; James 1:27).⁶⁷ From the Pastorals teachings, it is unclear what duties the author might assign to the enrolled older widows, although a church office later developed for such women. On 1 Tim 5:3–8, Verner says,

⁶⁵ While subsequent interpreters have struggled with this "saved through childbearing" idea, the author does not back down from this instruction, returning to it in 1 Tim 5:14, where he wants younger widows to "bear children" (τεκνογονεῖν), and also 1 Tim 5:10, where older widows must have "brought up children" (ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν), and Titus 2:4, where younger women need to "love their children" (φιλοτέκνους). The preferred term for a father's relationship to his children (included in his "household") appears to be προϊστημι: 1 Tim 3:4, 12.

⁶⁶ Other references to widows may be found in, e.g., Justin, *Apol.* 1:27; Grapte in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, *Vis* 2.4.3; Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 13.1. For discussion of the history of Christian widows, see Carolyn Osiek, "The Widow as Altar: The Rise and Fall of a Symbol" (*Second Century* 3, no. 3 [1983]:159–169), and Bonnie Bowman Thurston, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989). M.Y. MacDonald describes Lucian of Samosata's mention of Christian widows in *The Passing of Peregrinus*, 12–13 (*Early Christian Women*, 73–82). A more recent summary of the evidence for Christian widows is provided by Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald (*A Woman's Place*, 74–78).

⁶⁷ Some group of widows is referred to in Acts 9:39–41, where Peter calls "the saints and the widows" to see the newly-raised Dorcas. Yet rather than serving as evidence for an office of widows, the juxtaposition of "saints and widows" seems to me to indicate a communal living situation like that described in 1 Tim 5:16, where a "believing woman" is directed to provide for a group of widows.

If the church had official widows, then presumably they were given duties [Yet] one can find no clear indication of duties performed by enrolled widows. Nevertheless, this is not a particularly strong argument against the existence of an office of widows here. The Pastorals offer no real information about the duties of deacons either, although they certainly presuppose the deacon's office.⁶⁸

He reads 1 Tim 5:9–15 as a section that does “deal with the distinct problem of official widows The author argues that only elderly women should hold this office ...”⁶⁹ Yet, contra Verner, in this section the focus is on financial aid to impoverished widows, not on any remuneration for their ministry, as with the elders in 1 Tim 5:17–18. If the widows are not given any tasks to perform in order to receive benefits, how, then, do they “function” within the instructional texts of the Pastorals?

While the entire passage about widows in 1 Tim 5:3–16 consists of the author's redaction of various sources touching on widows in the Christian assembly, within “diese komplizierte Struktur,”⁷⁰ the types of widows are presented antithetically as examples for other Christian women—especially other widows—to follow or avoid.⁷¹ The widows section opens with a description of “real” widows (τὰς ὄντως χήρας, 1 Tim 5:3), and seeks to define

⁶⁸ *Household of God*, 164–165.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 165.

⁷⁰ This is Wagener's characterization of the text (*Die Ordnung*, 121). She provides a detailed exegesis of this text, including a scholarly review and plausible form-critical analysis (*Die Ordnung*, 115–231). In the end, she finds that vv. 3, 5, 9, and 11 come from traditional materials, while the author himself composes vv. 4, 6–8, 10, and 13–15 (*ibid.*, 227, and expanded at 228–233). (She views v. 16 as a later interpolation that attempts to bring the section to a more coherent end, 228.) This mixing of materials helps to explain the “Spannungen” between the various instructions, which are based in the author's attempt to address ascetic tendencies with a household-ecclesiology (*ibid.*, 227–228). Merz's analysis of Pauline “intertextuality” in the Pastorals does not include this passage, but there could be some fruitful research conducted along these lines which also takes Wagener's work into account. I am thinking, for example, of Paul's instructions to widows in 1 Cor 7: that they should marry (γαμησάτωσαν, v. 9), and his seeming preference for the *univira* ideal (vv. 39–40).

⁷¹ How many actual “widows” might have been present in Christian communities is, of course, unknown, but the mere fact that they are mentioned as a social group in so many early Christian texts gives the impression that there were not just one or two widows per assembly, confirmed by Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald (*A Woman's Place*, 74–78). Saller's analysis of a simulated demographic model of the Roman Empire suggests that widowhood was a common occurrence for adult women: “The simulation assumes that males up to age sixty and females up to age fifty remarry upon the death of the spouse. The Egyptian [census] data, however, reveal that women often did not remarry after divorce or widowhood, with the result that about half of the women in their later thirties were no longer married. Clearly, the assumption of universal female remarriage in the simulation is inaccurate, but there is no empirical evidence from the west to correct it” (*Patriarchy, Property and Death*, 68).

this category of woman for the purposes of discerning if a widow is eligible for financial support from the assembly.⁷² The author defines such a widow as: “But the real widow, even though she has been left alone (μεμονωμένη), has hope in God, and continues in supplications and prayers night and day” (1 Tim 5:5).

The two virtuous behaviors of the “real widow” meant to be emulated are “hoping in God,” and “continuing in supplications and prayers night and day,”⁷³ which epitomize the faithful behavior of “the real widow.” If the participle is translated concessively as I have done, then the author indicates that “hoping and praying” are perhaps not typical responses to widowhood, but rather are signs of exemplary faithfulness. However, if the participle were translated causally—“because she has been left alone”—then the widow has no choice but to turn to God for assistance. In either case, the example of the real widow’s prayer practice appears to contradict somewhat the

⁷² That financial assistance is at stake may be seen first in the word “honor” (5:3), which has connotations of “to set a price on, *estimate, value*,” BDAG, s.v. τιμάω. Bassler explains: “the word ‘honor’ thus has in this context clear economic implications ...” (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, 92). She then states “... it is difficult to find in 1 Timothy evidence that ‘real’ widows and ‘enrolled’ widows were two distinct groups. The passage opens and closes on the same note of concern for real widows, and the intervening instructions contain no obvious breaks It is likely that there was a single group, referred to either as ‘real’ or as ‘enrolled’ widows” (ibid., 92–93). Note that Bassler, unlike Wagener (cf. n. 150 above), finds that the passage reads smoothly. I agree with Bassler that the author perceives the only “real” widows to be those who are “left alone,” and thus in need of financial support from the assemblies. Yet this does not necessarily preclude the stitching together of sources that Wagener has proposed. Surely this author has the skill to define sections by various catch-words and inclusios (as in Titus 2:1 with 2:15).

For more on the expectation that children are responsible for the financial support of their parents in the ancient world, see Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 144–154; also, Tim Parkin, *Old Age in the Roman World: A Cultural and Social History* (Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 204–226; and Dixon, *The Roman Family*, 108–110. Parkin summarizes the situation of widows: “Widowed or divorced women without children or for that matter never-married women—the latter presumably relatively few in number—must have had the most difficult circumstances if they did not have control over inherited property and their own means of support About such individuals in ‘real life’ the literature is virtually silent. There is, however, some testimony from the Roman world for *pietas* toward aged parents working in practice” (*Old Age*, 212–213). This part of 1 Timothy 5 provides evidence that such support was also an expectation among some Christian communities.

⁷³ This “real” widow shares the faithful prayer practice of the widowed prophet Anna in Luke 2:36–38, who was “serving by fastings and supplications night and day” (νηστείας καὶ δεήσεων λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν). Note that by 1 Timothy’s standards, Anna would have met the age qualification for support, being over sixty years old. Cf. also the widow in Luke 18:1–8 who, as one of God’s elect (so God’s speech implies) cries to him “day and night” (ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, 18:7). Wagener supplies a more complete summation of the image of the faithful, praying widow in Old and New Testament writings (*Die Ordnung*, 127–143).

Pastorals' instructions about women's modest and subordinated silence in prayer (1 Tim 2:8–12). The author's image for men's praying involves sanctified bodily movement and appropriate speech, while women's participation in worship takes a more static posture: they are to be seen, but not too conspicuously, and definitely are not to be heard. Perhaps the widow is expected to pray in private, since she "has been left alone," and she does so "night and day" (that is, not continually in the presence of other people).

This exemplary figure is then contrasted directly with a different type: "the widow who is living luxuriously" (ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα), who "though living has died" (ζῶσα τέθνηκεν; 1 Tim 5:6). The contrast is carried off syntactically by means of parallel placement of articles and participles, and the subsequent use of the perfect tense (μεμονωμένη, ἤλπικεν, and τέθνηκεν). These verses differentiate the two widows' use of time and life-energy by picturing the real widow who "has hope in God" all along and who prays continuously, while the "widow who lives luxuriously" thinks she is alive, but has already died. The reverse inference is that even though the "real widow" may seem "dead" (to worldly desires? or in the eyes of those around her, since she is alone?), she is instead really living. The immoral widow, whose "luxurious living" reminds one of the adornment vices already decried in 1 Tim 2:9, is thus set up as an example to be avoided.

Such an instructional pattern continues, and at greater length, in the contrasting descriptions of "older" and "younger" widows that follow. The list of positive behaviors necessary in order for widows to be enrolled (1 Tim 5:9–10) differs to some extent from those prescribed for male office-holders at other points (e.g., 1 Tim 3:1b–10, 12–13). First of all, there is no age requirement for male leaders, although an *episkopos* ought not to be a new convert (νεόφυτος, 1 Tim 3:6a).⁷⁴ Second, the physical caretaking acts of foot-washing and helping the afflicted, while these seem to be distinctively Christian acts of service, have no counterparts in the qualifications for men in church office. Not even the deacons (1 Tim 3:8–13), a position which elsewhere involves serving at table (Acts 6:1–6), are told to show expertise in these arenas. Third, the specific "good works" delineated for enrolled widows are activities that were accomplished *in the past* which others had witnessed: "attested by good works: if she raised children, if she showed hospitality, if

⁷⁴ Dixon succinctly states that "the fact that retirement from the Roman senate customarily dated from [age sixty] reinforces the view that this was the accepted marker [of old age] ..." (*The Roman Family*, 150). For a more detailed examination of the evidence regarding "old age," see Parkin, *Old Age*, ch. 1, "Roman Definitions and Statements of Age"; ch. 4, "Rules of Age in the Roman Empire"; and ch. 5, "Rules of Age in Roman Egypt."

she washed the saints' feet, if she helped the afflicted, if she was devoted to every good work" (1 Tim 5:10). Although the author would certainly approved of enrolled widows who continued in such tasks, they are nevertheless presented as endeavors from earlier in their lives. In comparison, the male overseers, elders, and deacons are expected to keep their own households in order *in the present* (1 Tim 3:4–7, 12; 5:17; Titus 1:6, 8–9), and by negative contrast, the opponents are failing to meet appropriate household management standards even as the author writes (1 Tim 4:1–3; 2 Tim 3:6–7; Titus 1:10–11).

Fourth, the author maintains a consistent gender-differentiation in that the requirements for enrolled widows do not include any teaching or authority roles over men. Consequently, this list certifying enrolled widows also functions as the gold standard for faithful non-widows: by establishing these *past* deeds as the basis upon which widows are judged worthy to receive community support, *presently*-married women are encouraged to take up such Christian service *before* they face widowhood themselves.⁷⁵

The younger widows addressed next in vv. 11–15 function as a negative foil to the older widows, who are eligible to receive assistance from the assembly.⁷⁶ According to the author, these younger women are not at all devoted to good works; instead they are unproductive, taking every opportunity to go out and about, and participating in some kind of proscribed speech. Such activities ought to be avoided by enacting "Paul's" threefold command to marry, bear children, and manage a household (all of which are more likely to keep a woman within the physical boundaries of the house). However, it is not just social expectations for feminine decorum that are being transgressed in the actions of these widows, but Christian faith itself: the author asserts that they are "alienated" from Christ, have received judgment, and even have opened the assembly to reproach. The author's condemnation culminates in his repugnant assessment that some of them have turned away toward Satan himself. The younger widows' moral behavior is exactly opposite to that of the faithful/older/enrolled widows, whose lives have centered on hoping in God, prayer, and tangible expressions of Christian service.

⁷⁵ Wagener notes that the qualifications for enrolled older widows are *prerequisites* of "doing good works," that is, acts to be accomplished *before* being enrolled, which are unlike those requirements for the men who aspire to be a bishop, which is a good work in and of itself (*Die Ordnung*, 232).

⁷⁶ The linguistic links between the two groups come via their ages ("not less than sixty years old" and "younger widows") as well as the instructions "let a widow *be enrolled*" versus "but *refuse* [παραιτοῦ] [to enroll] the younger widows."

The whole section concludes with another instructional example: “If some faithful woman has widows, let her provide for them and let the assembly not be burdened, so that it may provide for the real widows” (1 Tim 5:16). Such a “faithful woman” (τις πιστῇ) would conduct herself well in comparison to the person criticized in 5:8, who, “if someone does not have forethought for their own people and most of all those of their household, they have denied the faith (τῇν πίστιν) and are worse than an unbeliever (ἀπίστου χείρων).” Having faith, or, being faithful, is demonstrated by providing for one’s household: it is a religious and ethical duty to “show piety towards one’s own household” (τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν).⁷⁷ This woman serves as an example to both male and female offspring who are instructed to care for the widows in their families in 1 Tim 5:4.

On further observation reveals a singular aspect of the position of widows within these texts as well as in the actual dynamics of life within the assembly. Since the author has taken up the template of the traditional household and overlaid it on the house church, the “real” widowed woman is now eligible for financial support from “God’s household” if there is no child or grandchild who will supply her needs (1 Tim 5:16). If she is alone, and without familial connections, the believing widow deserves to be cared for by her “new” family. She is no longer a lonely childless figure, but rather a woman worthy of the honor due to every parent, in this case from her “children in the faith.”

The author’s utilization of certain widows as moral examples shows that some women are indeed able to demonstrate virtuous behavior: (1) “real” widows, who hope in God, and pray night and day; (2) “enrolled” older widows, who have already accomplished “good works” within their household *and* in the assembly; and (3) the “faithful woman,” who provides for her own widows.⁷⁸ All of these paradigmatic figures are authorized as examples by their woman-specific virtue and behavior. Counter-examples meant to discourage women’s immoral behavior are: (1) the “widow who lives luxuriously,” and whose lifestyle prevents her from perceiving her morally fatal condition; and (2) the “younger widows,” who, when they evade their three

⁷⁷ Mary Rose D’Angelo shows that, comparable to Roman *pietas*, “εὐσέβεια as a way of life [was] characterized by both devotion to the deity and by familial and imperial duty ...” (“Εὐσέβεια,” 162).

⁷⁸ It appears that the “enrolled” older widows are a subset of the “real” widows, and the author’s list of their qualifications (5:9–10) gives additional information about why they serve as good examples. The πιστῇ ἔχει χάρις of 5:16 may not be a widow herself, but she is certainly enacting the appropriate faithful attitude toward widows by providing for them.

socially significant roles of wife, mother and despoina, have in fact enacted a theological decision which is branded as turning away after Satan. The actions of these latter women are comparable to the “thorough deception” of their Mother, Eve, who remains in transgression.

3. *Historical Examples: Lois and Eunice, Prisca and Claudia*

In addition to Eve, only a few other named women appear in the Pastorals, and, unlike Eve, these women are chosen in order to evoke the author’s vision of limited female leadership within the Pauline tradition. Rather than setting up women like Phoebe (Rom 16:1–2), Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:2–3), and Lydia (Acts 16:14–15, 40) each of whom contributed much to Paul’s work, this author selects women in socially traditional roles who are related to prominent men in the Pauline traditions. Of special interest to this investigation are the women identified as Timothy’s relatives.⁷⁹ “Paul” writes to Timothy that he remembers “the sincere faith in you, which dwelt first in your grandmother Lois and in your mother Eunice, and I am convinced that [it dwells] also in you” (2 Tim 1:5).⁸⁰ Lois and Eunice have two attributes in common: (1) they possess a “sincere faith” that has been passed down to the young man Timothy, and (2) because of this, they are virtuous mothers. Thus their faith is embodied primarily in their successful mothering, an activity which ought to be imitated by later female believers.

Here once again is found the notion that faith can be learned by observing and following the lives of upright Christians, a point that is interpreted further by Donelson:

Although these relationships [of Timothy, Lois, and Eunice] reflect more the author’s concern with educational activities in his church than his particular idea of succession, the possibility of something so allusive and ineffable

⁷⁹ Timothy’s mother is referred to as an unnamed “Jewish woman” in Acts 16:1. This idea is expanded in 2 Timothy 1:5 to include his grandmother and both their names. Fiore links this verse to the author’s use of “examples from the past,” and describes it as “the express assumption of a continuity of faith between Timothy, his mother and his grandmother ...” (*Function of Personal Example*, 19, n. 57). Bassler states about Timothy’s genealogy: “By referring also to Lois (his grandmother), the letter pushes Timothy’s faithful ancestry back another generation. The author’s primary purpose in mentioning her was to indicate that, like Paul’s, Timothy’s religious heritage has stability and antiquity” (1 *Timothy*, 2 *Timothy*, *Titus*, 129). Obviously, I would revise this characterization of the “author’s primary purpose” by adding another purpose for the reference to Timothy’s maternal relatives: that the author is able to valorize faithful mothers.

⁸⁰ Such “unhypocritical” faith is also referred to in 1 Tim 1:5, as one of the three aspects of love: τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρὰς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου.

as faith being repeated in subsequent generations illustrates our author's capacity for believing that a life-style could be transmitted through time by a process of imitation.⁸¹

It seems to me that Donelson argues against himself somewhat by calling faith "allusive and ineffable," but then tying it to one's "life-style." How could the Pastorals' visible, practical ways of living be so imperceptible to others? But maybe Donelson is attempting to speak to the (more modern?) theological distinction sometimes made between "belief" and "practice," and wants to assert, as the Pastorals certainly would, that "sincere faith" is not simply a matter of Timothy's, or anyone else's, intellectual assent to Christian creeds, but absolutely extends to one's way of life. In any case, in this verse we have the idea that the exercise of "faith" for female believers is in large part a matter of religious formation of their children and grandchildren. The faith of Lois and Eunice is "sincere" because they enact it in their role as mothers.

With maternal figures portrayed as playing a role in Timothy's acquisition and subsequent manifestation of faith, we are reminded that our author shares the conventional Greco-Roman expectation that a woman must be involved in childrearing.⁸² As in *Myia to Phyllis* and *Theano to Euboule*, in the Pastorals, women are exhorted regarding their relationship to their children in 1Tim 2:15; 5:10, 14; and Titus 2:4. While it is true of these letters that men have an important role as fathers (1Tim 3:4, 12; Titus 1:6), historically "there can be no denying the special influence of women, especially in the early years of childhood ..., even though influence should by no means be restricted to mothers."⁸³ The author of the Pastorals has unusually extended this maternal influence even to Timothy's grandmother, who perhaps first passed on the faith to her daughter Eunice, and thence to Timothy.

⁸¹ *Pseudepigraphy*, 169.

⁸² That only female relatives are mentioned here is often taken as a hint of some historical fact about Timothy's life. This seems to be the basis of Acts 16:1, where Timothy's father is contrasted with his mother: "[he was] the son of a faithful Jewish woman, but his father was Greek" (υἱὸς γυναικὸς Ἰουδαίας πιστῆς, πατὴρ δὲ Ἕλληνας). Joanna Dewey speculates that it might imply that Timothy's male relatives "were not Christian" ("2 Timothy," 359). Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald seem to assume that these women were widows: "The general prominence of widows in early Christianity may have created a powerful venue for influencing children ... and contributed to the expansion of early church groups. The Pastoral Epistles, for example, speak of Timothy's faith being kindled by his grandmother Lois and his mother, Eunice (2Tim 1:5), perhaps on account of the special influence of widows in managing the affairs of their children ..." (*A Woman's Place*, 25–26).

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 70. A more complete discussion of the historical evidence for the activities of Roman mothers can be found, in Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place*, ch. 4; and Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), 1–40, 104–140, and *The Roman Family*, ch. 4.

Since the author requires women to bear children (1Tim 5:14), to rear them (1Tim 5:10), and to love them (Titus 2:4), and since he marks these related activities as “good works” and even salvific for women, Lois and Eunice represent quintessentially successful Christian mothers. We can validly presume that they did not “spoil” the male child under their care, as Euboule is in danger of doing. No doubt, just as *Theano to Euboule* instructs, they withheld excessive comforts, monitored his exposure to pleasures, and allowed Timothy to experience hardships. The proof of their *good* mothering (to the *sōphrōn* way of life) is that this adult man has taken up the “training in godliness” (1Tim 4:7b) so that he is able to be a τύπος of virtuous conduct for others. Not only can he “fight the good fight” (1Tim 6:12), he has suffered emotionally (2Tim 1:4) as well as physically (2Tim 1:8; 2:3–6).

In fact, the women have performed their duties so well that their male offspring, the famous co-worker of Paul, is now the named recipient of two letters from the apostle, in which Timothy is showered with affirmation and positive reinforcement as the bearer of the Pauline tradition. The reflected glory implicitly falls upon Lois and Eunice,⁸⁴ and a female Christian reader might hold out a similar hope of Christian achievement for her own children, and be spurred on to follow the example of these two celebrated mothers. The promise of salvation for mothers in 1Tim 2:15 may also be relevant here. If, as John Chrysostom thought,⁸⁵ a woman’s *children* are the subject of the protasis, then the children’s faithfulness has a direct effect on whether their mother is even saved. Evidence for this position is sometimes also found in the reference to the teaching by Lois and Eunice, whom the author has erected as prime examples of maternal influence in passing on the faith. In sum, the two women have performed triple service: (1) they properly mothered the child within their own household; (2) they have also nurtured the Christian community by adding one outstanding believer to its number; and now (3) they function as salutary models for other faithful women. This is one further example of how the customary female household roles overlap with those conceived of for women in the house churches.

Two other women, Prisca (with her husband Aquila) and a certain Claudia are mentioned in the closing greetings of 2Timothy (4:19, 21b), but

⁸⁴ And upon Paul, since Timothy is his “true child in the faith” (γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει, 1Tim 1:2); also, Paul’s “beloved child” (ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ, 2Tim 1:2). Cf. also, Titus 1:4, where Titus is also called “true child according to a common faith” (γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν).

⁸⁵ For the citations, see Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 301, nn. 123, 124; also, Mitchell, “Corrective Composition,” 60–61.

without additional description. Of course within the Pauline corpus and Acts, Prisca is known as a teacher and Paul's valued co-worker,⁸⁶ so that the pseudonymous author needs to be careful about invoking the memory of such a famed female Pauline leader. Since she is always presented as a married woman in the extant texts, she still might function as a good example for Christian women, especially if, as here, she is simply named alongside her husband and without any further reference to her Christian missionary activities. "Claudia" is otherwise unfamiliar,⁸⁷ but it is quite possible that she is also represented as a wife, married to the "Linus" whose name immediately precedes hers. In any case, she is syntactically "surrounded" by men: "Eubulus and Pudens and Linus and Claudia and all the brothers [and sisters] greet you." Because the author depicts both Prisca and Claudia as located within the proper feminine context—as wives and subordinate to men—these two stand as secondary examples for other women, while providing additional evidence that the author's gender ideology is consistent throughout the Pastorals.

4. *Examples of Unnamed Older Women*

As has already been shown, in Titus 2:3–5 the author of the Pastorals instructs older women to act as examples for younger women in their moral training. The older women are explicitly offered as "good teachers," and their "teaching" role primarily involves modeling proper behavior for the younger women, both in the fictional Pauline past, and in the author's present.⁸⁸ The instructional method works in this way: by looking to all these "moral" and

⁸⁶ Rom 16:3–5a ("Prisca and Aquila"); 1 Cor 16:19 ("Aquila and Prisca"); Acts 18:2–3 ("Aquila and Priscilla"), 18–19 ("Priscilla and Aquila"), 24–26 ("Priscilla and Aquila"). Some recent research attempts to find meaning in the ordering of the couple's names, but this has not proved especially fruitful, since, as Towner summarizes: "It is striking that in four of the six occurrences of the two names, Prisca is mentioned first, as she is here (cf. Act 18:2; 1 Cor 16:19) This would suggest that she was an important figure, but the degree to which this is a reflection of her social status or greater importance in the church's ministry is impossible to determine" (*Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 651).

⁸⁷ Dibelius and Conzelmann say it is a common name and discuss how such names "prove" the authorship of pseudonymous letters (*Pastoral Epistles*, 125–128). Donelson agrees, viewing these names, along with others, as part and parcel of the "personalia, the extraneous detail, the sense of friendship" used to support the pseudepigraphic efforts of the author, and, especially, to reproduce the greetings in the Pauline corpus (*Pseudepigraphy*, 54–56).

⁸⁸ F.M. Young describes how moral examples are supposed to operate in the hierarchical Greco-Roman household: "the head of the household is not just apex but example to all lower ranks, so there are hierarchical relationships among the women of the household, and women should both set an example to and teach the women lower down the hierarchy" (*Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 90).

“immoral” older women, younger women could theoretically project into their own future and make choices based on their insights.

When the author of the Pastorals uses old age rhetorically as a factor in his moral and immoral examples,⁸⁹ his assessments exploit a range of social, historical, and rhetorical perceptions of older persons, especially older women, in Greco-Roman contexts.⁹⁰ Of the ancient sources, Tim G. Parkin states: “... in comedy, for example, a negative picture of old age comes as little surprise, whereas philosophers grappled with the problem of the role of older people in society, particularly as they themselves grew older, and presented an image with both positive and negative aspects.”⁹¹ While images of and attitudes toward old age vary considerably within different kinds of literature, the “satiric-comic tradition is the harshest, directed especially against women.”⁹² Parkin notes that such stereotypes of older women include: brothel madams, crones and witches, alcoholics and gossips.⁹³ However, Dixon concludes that “the representation of older women in prose sources and epitaphs ... is generally much more positive.”⁹⁴ As we have seen in the Pythagorean women’s letters, the older woman Melissa serves as a perfectly virtuous example for Kleareta, while the esteemed Theano likewise embodies the highest moral capacity for her recipients Euboule, Nikostrate, and Kallisto.

⁸⁹ For a brief discussion of respect for old age in the Pastorals, see Verner, *Household of God*, 171–173. Also, F.M. Young comments about the office of “elder”: “... as in any household of antiquity, age bore with it a certain status and authority. It was the older people who were guardians of the corporate memory. They were not to be lightly disregarded, still less corrected. Timothy himself was to deal with his elders respectfully” (*Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, 107 and her further investigation of “elders,” 104–111).

⁹⁰ It is necessary to keep in mind Parkin’s comment that “The literary sources on occasion may give subjective views of and opinions on old age, statements influenced by individual impressions as well as, perhaps, by ulterior political, social, or economic motivations and by adherence to literary or philosophical topoi. Such references cannot and should not be held to be generally representative of any time, place, or social class, if indeed of any one individual” (*Old Age*, 7). Similarly, Pratt warns: “As classicists, we will no doubt be closer to the truth if we can stop thinking of ‘old women in ancient Greece’ as a distinct and homogeneous social class to which a single value can be assigned or as a monolithic category provoking a uniform emotional reaction” (“The Old Women of Ancient Greece,” 63).

⁹¹ *Old Age*, 58–59.

⁹² Parkin’s statement is concise and evocative: “The stereotyped old woman is, in sum, a disgusting, haggard, stinking, toothless, and sex-crazed *fellatrix*” (*Old Age*, 86).

⁹³ *Old Age*, 86. Says Dixon, “The stock figure of the old woman, perceived in these literary forms from the masculine perspective, is sinister, repellent, and even dangerous” (*The Roman Family*, 152).

⁹⁴ *The Roman Family*, 152.

Within the Pastorals, differing stereotypical elements of older women are in evidence. A negative example is the widow who is living luxuriously (ἡ ... σπαταλῶσα), while another is found in the reference to “avoid old women’s myths” (1 Tim 4:7). The characterizations of senior females as slanderers and drinkers persist in the negated vices of Titus 2:3: μή διαβόλους μηδὲ οἶνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας. Younger women need to steer clear of any such older women, and to take steps to ensure that their own old age assumes a different form. The author sets up this course of action by positive appraisals of older women: the “real” older widows of 1 Timothy 5, whose continual prayers and hope in God set an example; Timothy’s grandmother Lois, who passed on her faith to later generations; and the older women teachers in Titus 2 who are models of *sōphrosynē*. All these serve as role models of Christian faith and give substance to the better future envisioned for the younger women.

5. *Examples for Men and Women*

The author’s gendered worldview leads to some strong tensions when he provides examples for various social groups within his actual audience. His “feminine” examples do not explicitly work toward the dissuasion or persuasion of men since they are provided with masculine examples of morality to follow (Paul, Timothy, Titus, male office-holders) and other immoral examples to avoid (the heretical opponents). On the other hand, it seems to me that immoral women stand as anti-types for men, as well as for women. The figure of Eve, the younger widows, the “frivolous women,” and the references to women’s slander and drinking are all used as images of how the lives of women might go awry, and the author describes these in terms meant to be repugnant to readers of both sexes. Furthermore, male teachers are sometimes implicated in the women’s heterodoxy (1 Tim 4:1–3; 2 Tim 3:6–7), and are certainly held accountable for imparting the “healthy teaching” (1 Tim 1:10; 6:3; 2 Tim 1:13; 4:3; Titus 1:9; 2:1, 15). The author’s examples of moral and immoral female behavior concretely delineate for male church officials what that teaching ought to look like for women.

In addition, when the author derisively tells Timothy, and through him later male leaders, to “avoid old womanly myths” (1 Tim 4:7a), he invokes gender as well as age stereotypes in order to establish an “opposite” way of teaching for Timothy. In this approach, he briefly hints at the perspective found in physiognomic texts from the period that purport to judge the true masculinity of men.⁹⁵ “Real” men do not walk, talk, adorn, or comport themselves

⁹⁵ Once again, the “men” being discussed are free men, not male slaves, whose bodies were not their own and whose masculinity was also in question.

generally in an effeminate manner.⁹⁶ In effect moral men must pay attention to both sides of the gender polarity in order to distinguish themselves from women in two ways. First, in the view of the Pastorals, they ought not adopt the moral behavior of women: men should not be subordinate or silent, nor should they focus on childrearing and housework. Second, like the women, every man himself ought to avoid all the vices denigrated even further by their association with females, and especially those of elderly women: slander, drinking, idle chitchat, and wrong teaching. Thus, by employing both positive and negative female stereotypes, the author provides antithetical standards for both women and men in his audience.

And yet the prescription for treating female immorality is marriage and childbearing, which obviously requires participation from men. Certainly men, especially the male office-holders and teachers, are also expected to enforce these Pauline prescriptions for the behavior of women in their own household and in the household of God. That is one reason the author wrote letters to an audience of both sexes: so that “Paul’s” moral standards would be clarified and properly executed by *all* members of the household of God.

FURTHER COMPARISONS WITH THE PYTHAGOREAN LETTERS

To reiterate, both corpora elevate older virtuous women as teachers for young women, especially as examples of virtue. The names of the female Pythagorean authors function in this way by means of the plentiful literature and legends about them. The Pastorals lift up the names of a few women from the Pauline traditions, and position them as virtuous within their household relationships. Yet since the “older” wives and widows of the Pastorals remain unidentified, the reader is meant to look around her for older women in her assembly that fit the author’s ideal descriptions and then to emulate these genuine examples.

The older women “authors” of the Pythagorean letters employ two main teaching “techniques”: paraenesis (*Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis*, and *Theano to Kallisto*), and censure (*Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate*). The paraenesis is friendly and operates by way of reminding the

⁹⁶ Gleason notes that the social construction of “manhood” in the Roman world must be defined over and against that of “womanhood,” so that any perceived male deviance from the standard is viewed as a feminization of the man; she cites Polemo’s gender-differentiated combination of body and morality: “You ought to know, moreover, that the male is in all respects stronger, less deceitful, braver, less defective, and more steadfast in adversity than the female” (*Making Men*, 36; her translation of *Phys.* 2.1.198F).

reader what is already well known and accepted. In the two censorious letters, “Theano” drives home her points by means of strong direct language (imperatives and direct address) allied with exaggerated caricatures, e.g., of the spoiled child and the recklessly plotting wife. The older women of Titus 2:3–4 are allowed a similar method vis-à-vis young women, which is summed up in the verb σωφρονίζειν. Thus, in both corpora, older women may remind and rebuke young women, all the while acting as exemplary figures to be emulated.

The antitheses offered for women in the Pastorals have some counterparts in the Pythagorean letters. Promises and warnings are utilized throughout these texts in order to ensure that women will display proper *sōphrosynē*: that marriages will stay together (*Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Nikostrate*; 1 Tim 3:2, 12; 4:1–5; 5:9, 14; Titus 1:6; 2:4–5); that children will grow up well (e.g., *Myia to Phyllis* and *Theano to Euboule*; 1 Tim 3:4–5, 12; 5:4, 10, 14; 2 Tim 1:5; 3:2; Titus 1:6, 2:4); and that households will be managed in an orderly fashion (*Melissa to Kleareta*, *Theano to Nikostrate*, and *Theano to Kallisto*; 1 Tim 3:4–5, 12, 15; 5:8, 14; 2 Tim 3:6; Titus 1:11; 2:5). Likewise, both corpora construct antitheses of virtues and vices in order to encourage desirable behaviors and discourage what is objectionable. It is notable that in the case of *Myia to Phyllis* as well as in the Pastorals, such lists take the form of job qualifications.

As for the epistolary purpose of female examples, both Eve (1 Tim 2:13–14) and Medea (*Theano to Nikostrate*) are used as mythic women who are unable to control their passions. Eve’s response to the serpent has been given a sexual connotation, and Medea acts out her murderous rage arising from her jealousy toward her husband’s next wife. The *hetairai* mentioned in *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Theano to Nikostrate* are also women whose sexuality defines their complete immorality, but *hetairai* are absent from the Pastorals. The closest counterparts are found in the γυναῖκες ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (2 Tim 3:6–7), who act as if they are seduced by the disorderly opponents. Then too, the Pythagorean letters lack any mention of historical women as examples, while the Pastorals do elevate a few notable women identified with the Pauline tradition: Lois, Eunice, Prisca, and Claudia.

The “real” widow’s “alone-ness” in 1 Tim 5:5 is remarkably comparable to two situations in the Pythagorean letters. First is “Theano’s” prediction of what will happen to Nikostrate if she divorces her present husband: “you will remain alone (μόνη) without a man.”⁹⁷ This divorced woman is also

⁹⁷ μόνη μενεῖς ἀπ’ ἀνδρός, *Theano to Nikostrate* (line 55).

considered to be a widow, since the author claims: “widowhood (χήρεϊα) is not bearable for young women.”⁹⁸ Second is the “solitary state of the *despoina*” (ἡ τῆς δεσποίνης μόνωσις) who treats her slaves unjustly, as depicted in *Theano to Kallisto* (lines 37–38). In these two cases, the single woman is perceived as a lonely, bitter figure whose status is definitely to be avoided. The author of the Pastorals sees at least some widows differently. The widows he approves for enrollment, those over sixty years old, do not seem to have taken action that led to their situation, as with Nikostrate and the unhappy *despoina*. Rather, they have become widows through no fault of their own: their husbands have died.⁹⁹ The author’s ideal widow is not at all bitter, but is instead an example of faithfulness in hope and prayer. Indeed, the Pastorals anticipate that some widows might find spiritual worth and economic sustenance (1 Tim 5:3–10), and might even be living communally rather than alone (1 Tim 5:16). Thus, at least theoretically, a believing woman could contemplate widowhood with more confidence and purpose than the “unbearable” and “desolate” state warned against in the Pythagorean texts.

On the other hand, the author seems to view the position of younger widows in the same way as *Theano to Nikostrate* which states bluntly: “widowhood is not bearable for young women.” 1 Timothy foresees that when the young widows “feel sensuous impulses that alienate them from Christ, they wish to marry.” His solution is to encourage that wish, so that they will conscientiously take up their proper domestic roles (1 Tim 5:14). Unlike 1 Timothy, the Pythagorean letter uses this assessment of young women to advise Nikostrate not to divorce her husband. Still both letters deem that marriage is the most suitable state for all young women.

CONCLUSIONS

By composing three paraenetic letters, ostensibly sent to Timothy and Titus, but in reality to be read and studied in his own communities, the author of the Pastorals reveals his assumption that the aims and stylistic features of paraenesis will connect with both women and men in his audience. That is,

⁹⁸ οὐ φορητὴ γὰρ νέαις χηρεϊα, *Theano to Nikostrate* (lines 54–55). The parallel to the *Theano to Nikostrate* is also discussed by Wagener (*Die Ordnung*, 127, n. 59), but she does not refer to *Theano to Kallisto*.

⁹⁹ I say this because he refers to their being “wife of one husband” as a qualification for enrollment (1 Tim 5:9). He also thinks of some of these women having children and grandchildren (1 Tim 5:4). The more anomalous situation is the “believing woman” who has widows (1 Tim 5:16).

he thinks that women have the capacity to be moved to avoid evil and to attain goodness by means of the same rhetorical strategies used to instruct men: friendly letters, full of reminders of already known material, and relying on antithetical argumentation focusing on punishment and rewards, vices and virtues, and immoral and moral examples. This author evidently believes that the primary philosophical-educational method of dissuasion and persuasion is effective for women as well as men. His assumption corresponds to that of the Pythagorean texts, which employ most of the same techniques for their female recipients and thus the women in their audience.

Yet, while the early audiences of the Pythagorean letters encounter the perhaps unreachable heights of *sōphrosynē* embodied by the legendary Melissa, Myia, and Theano, the readers of the Pastorals have a different experience. First, they often come into literary contact with persons who actually lived not so very far in the past. Although a certain amount of mythologizing about Paul, Timothy, Titus, Lois and Eunice certainly occurred, they were historical figures whose personal morality and idiosyncrasies were perhaps still known by some, and thus they could serve as “real” role models. Second, when the author adopts and promotes the larger Pauline tradition, he clearly expects his actual audience of believers to search for ways to implement his version of that *parathēkē* in their present lives. Third, the fact that the Pastorals’ moral curriculum is meant to be learned in a community setting implies *group* interactions: discussions, readings, and listening. The author intends for the audience to study the virtues attributed to individuals in the letters and then to transfer the concepts to living rightly in the very household of God of which one was a member. By literally enacting the “healthy teaching,” the older women and men, the male church officers, their wives and children, all the believing mothers and widows in one’s own house church would thus carry on the earlier Pauline tradition within their very selves. Such a communal educational setting would ensure that the young people, neophytes, and other inferiors would be surrounded and exhorted by mature virtuous Christian examples all of whom are suitable for imitation. For younger women, such a community would serve an especially crucial purpose: in order to set limits on their literal and possibly heretical wanderings, they need to be subordinate to faithful men, and trained by the older women to channel their energies into the blameless fulfillment of their respectable household roles.

CHAPTER EIGHT

TOPICS FOR WOMEN

With this chapter, my investigation shifts focus from teaching strategies to the content of what is being taught, asking: what subject matter was considered a necessary part of the curriculum for the women in the assemblies envisioned as the Pastorals' audience? As will be shown, the author draws upon the familiar contours of the Greco-Roman *topos* of "the good woman" even as he worked in particular theological justifications for its acceptance and enactment by his female audience (and enforcement by husbands and male leaders). Thus, as with other classical articulations of the *topos* including the Pythagorean letters, he places *sōphrosynē* at the very core, so that the virtue becomes encased by a woman's marital fidelity. Modest adornment and demeanor, along with proper religious practices and the feminine household roles of mother and *despoina* radiate outward from these two crucial elements. My analysis of *sōphrosynē* in the Pastorals, especially as applied to women, builds on North's characterization of the feminine form of this virtue, as well as Wagener's exegesis, who remarks that female *sōphrosynē* has a "primär sexuellen Bestimmung."¹ What I have added to them is a more detailed outline of "the good woman" *topos* in the Pastorals, one that describes the interrelationships between feminine *sōphrosynē* and its consequent manifestations. This prescribed pattern differs from that stipulated for the men in the author's churches: a woman's *sōphrosynē* first and foremost depends upon her marital sexual fidelity, while at the same time, although Christian men must also practice faithfulness in marriage, male *sōphrosynē* is less emphasized and carries a more general meaning of self-control and sound mind.

SŌPHROSYNĒ IN THE PASTORAL LETTERS

The author of the Pastorals evidently believed that the "ordinary people" in his reading-communities could model *sōphrosynē*. His letters are the earliest extant Christian texts to espouse the virtue in its gender-differentiated

¹ *Die Ordnung*, 67–85, 88–89; here 85.

forms. Σωφροσύνη and the cognates σωφρονίζειν, σωφρονεῖν, σωφρονισμός, σωφρόνως, and σώφρων are distinctive terms in the Pastorals, with ten out of sixteen total New Testament occurrences in the Pastorals.² Moreover, Paul only rarely used this word group: σωφρονέω appears twice in Rom 12:3 and once in 2 Cor 5:13.

The Pastorals teach both men and women to exhibit *sōphrosynē*: the virtue is urged an equal number of times for women (for all women, 1 Tim 2:9, 15; older women, Titus 2:4; younger women, Titus 2:5) and men (for overseers, 1 Tim 3:2 and Titus 1:8; for older men, Titus 2:2; for younger men, Titus 2:6). It is twice applied to the entire readership:

- (1) 2 Tim 1:7, “For God did not give *to us* a spirit of cowardice, but of power and of love and of moderation [σωφρονισμός]”;³ and,
- (2) Titus 2:11–12, “For the grace of our savior God appeared to all people, training *us* so that by denying impiety and worldly desires we might live moderately [σωφρόνως] and justly and piously in the present age.”

The Pastorals’ insistence upon *sōphrosynē* for both men and women signals the author’s intent to convey moral instruction to a “co-educational” Christian community, and reflects his conventional Greco-Roman ideology that both sexes need to obtain this virtue.

Yet *sōphrosynē* for women still takes on specifically “feminine” expressions, beginning with the requirement for marital fidelity demonstrated by modest behavior and morally correct acts within the circumscribed arena

² These are: σωφροσύνη in 1 Tim 2:9, 15; σωφρονίζειν in Titus 2:4 (NT *hapax legomenon*); σωφρονεῖν in Titus 2:6; σωφρονισμός, in 2 Tim 1:7 (NT *hapax legomenon*); σωφρόνως in Titus 2:12 (another NT *hapax legomenon*); and σώφρων in 1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:8; 2:2, 5. For further discussion, see Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, Excursus V, 304). For references to earlier secondary literature, see Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 375–385, and his excursus that covers the advice for women in the Pastorals: “La femme chrétienne et ses vertus” (ibid., 385–425); also, Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 44–49. Winter exegetes 1 Tim 2:9–15, translating *sōphrosynē* as “self-control” (*Roman Wives*, 97–122). North offers a very short summary of the New Testament concept of *sōphrosynē* and assumes that the Pastorals were written by Paul. She states: “To Paul *sōphrosyne* usually signifies self-control and mastery of the appetites. He associates it with *aidōs* (1 Tim, 2:9), with *enkrateia* (Tit. 1:8, one of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, Gal. 5:23), with sobriety (Tit. 2:2, 6), and in the case of women, with conjugal love (*philandria*: 1 Tim. 2:9; Titus 2:2, 5). Although, like most moralists in the Greek world, he construes *sōphrosyne* as the essential virtue of women (Tit. 2:6 [sic, should be Titus 2:4–5?], 1 Tim, 2:9), he also enjoins it upon men of every age (Tit. 2:2, 6) and specifically lists it among the qualifications of a bishop (Tit. 1:8, 1 Tim. 3:2)” (*Sōphrosyne*, 317).

³ Within the fiction of the letter, this could be thought to mean that only Paul and Timothy have these gifts of the Spirit, but surely the pseudonymous author intended to include every believing reader in his grand statement.

of the household. Again this conception is wholly consistent with the *topos* of “the good woman” found in other Greek moral-philosophical texts, especially in the Pythagorean letters. An analysis of the Pastorals’ use of *sōphro-*cognates for men and women shows that the author perceives gender-based differences in how this virtue is acted out.

Sōphrosynē for Women

In the Pastorals, each time a “*sōphro-*” word is used particularly for women, it is connected with traditionally feminine behavior and activities.

(1) *1 Timothy 2:9–3:1a*: As in *Melissa to Kleareta*, the noun *sōphrosynē* is linked with two other moral adornments for women: decorum (κόσμος) and shame (αἰδώς): “Likewise also [I wish] women to adorn themselves in decorous bearing with modesty and *sōphrosynē*.” These are then opposed to immoral adornments: “not in braided hair and gold or pearls or expensive clothing,” followed by a restatement of what moral adornment consists in: “but what is proper for women who profess godly-piety, through good works.” *Sōphrosynē* occurs again in *1 Tim 2:15*: “but she will be saved through child-bearing, if they remain in faith and in love and in holiness with *sōphrosynē*.” Here *sōphrosynē* hearkens back to its usage in 2:9, but is given specific Christian theological substance by the reference to being saved, and by the addition of three terms (ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ) that evoke the Pauline triad of πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη of *1 Cor 13:13*.⁴ Thus, *sōphrosynē* appears near the beginning and the end of this passage, forming an *inclusio* for the instructions contained within. These include the command that women ought to learn in silence and in all subordination, the so-called teaching prohibition for women, and the author’s justifications for these based upon his interpretation of events in Genesis 2–3.

(2) *Titus 2:3–5*: As explored in the previous chapter, the verb σωφρονίζειν is applied to the teaching activity of the older women. According to Quinn, the use of this verb “practically designates a fifth virtuous quality” for the older women, as it also links the older women to the set of seven virtues required of young women.⁵

⁴ Cf. also other Pauline triads in *1 Thess 1:3*; *5:8*.

⁵ *Letter to Titus*, 134. Of verses 3–4a Quinn says: “Thus far the language of this household code has often been unusual; it now gathers into a knot of terminology practically unexampled in this correspondence or in biblical Greek. Four attributes are urged on the

The adjective σῶφρων is also included in the list of virtuous qualities for those younger women in Titus 2:4b–5: “to be loving of husbands, loving of children, *sōphrōn*, pure, good house-workers,⁶ subordinated to their own husbands.” In Titus 2:3–5, it is as if the younger women are struck twice by the requirement to be *sōphrōn*, with the author directing the “energy” of *sōphrosynē* first through the older women and then repeating the requirement that the younger women exercise it as well.⁷

Sōphrosynē for Men

In the Pastorals, while the quality of being *sōphrōn* is certainly recommended for men, there is less emphasis on their display of this virtue as shown by the lack of explication of how it is to be enacted.

(1) 1 Tim 3:2–4: The adjective σῶφρων appears in 1 Tim 3:2–4 as one in a long list of mostly single words that comprise the qualifications for the office of the ἐπίσκοπος:

It is necessary for the overseer to be irreproachable, husband of one wife, sober, *sōphrōn*, decorous, hospitable, skilled at teaching, not addicted to wine, not a bully, but tolerant, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money, presiding well over his own house, having children in subjection with every dignity.

elder Christian women, in a chiasmic positive-negative (*mē*)/negative (*mēdē*)-positive order in which the fourth entry expands into a purposive clause, which in its turn practically designates a fifth virtuous quality. The more expansive phrasing of these qualities, coupled with their at best partial coincidence with the virtues for older men and their obvious linkage with the virtues for young wives, all conspire to give vv. 3–5 a unity of their own” (ibid., 134).

⁶ Bassler comments that “The Greek term (*oikourgous*) simply describes one who works at home and does not highlight a managerial role there. An alternative reading found in some Greek manuscripts (*oikouros*) speaks only of staying at home. This was a widely praised trait in women of that time (see Plutarch *Advice to Bride and Groom* 30, 32) and corresponds closely to views the author has expressed elsewhere (1 Tim 5:13). Nevertheless, the rarer word *oikourgous* is found in the earlier and better manuscripts and is probably the original reading. It defines the household as the appropriate sphere for women’s activities without implying the considerable authority the matron of a house could have within that sphere” (1 Timothy, 196). However, see 1 Tim 5:14 for the three roles of younger widows: γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν, οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, the last of which does signify some “rule” over the household.

⁷ Winter rightly picks up on this sexualized connotation of *sōphronas* in Titus 2:5, saying that the term (which he consistently translates as “self-control”) “covered sexual conduct in the context of relationships with the opposite gender. Its antonym, ‘self-indulgence,’ related to inappropriate and unrestrained sexual behavior that accompanied extravagant lifestyle” (*Roman Wives*, 160). He discusses this further in ch. 4: “New Wives and Philosophical Responses,” where he cites some fragments of Musonius Rufus and the Pythagorean texts *Melissa to Kleareta*, *Theano to Euboule*, *On the Sōphrosynē*, and *On the Harmony*, 59–74.

While some of these terms are brought together in various places in the Pastorals in order to describe feminine virtues,⁸ other virtues and vices appear to have a more masculine association: *μὴ πλῆκτης* (Titus 1:7), and *διδασκτικός* (2 Tim 2:25). From the structure of this list from 1 Timothy 3, the masculine characteristic of being *sōphrōn* appears to carry a different (and less important?) connotation than in the instructions for women just examined. It occurs merely as the second of seven terms, and without any further expansion of its meaning.

(2) *Titus 1:7–8*: A similar context for *σώφρων* is found in Titus 1:7–8,⁹ which continues the listing of the requisite character traits for an *episkopos*:

If some man is blameless, husband of one wife, having faithful children who are not under an accusation of debauchery or disobedience. For it is necessary that the overseer, as God's household-manager, be irreproachable, not self-willed, not quick-tempered, not drunken, not a bully, not fond of shameful gain, but hospitable, loving what is good, *sōphrōn*, just, devout, self-controlled
....

Here again, the emphasis on *sōphrosynē* is quite different from that applied to women, since the adjective is one of several individual terms, falling in the middle of a list, and thus not closely tied to any other specific behavior or quality.

(3) *Titus 2:2*: The adjective *σώφρων* is used again for the “older men” of Titus 2:2, who are called to be *sōphrōn*, along with other generally virtuous terms: “older men are to be sober, dignified, *sōphrōn*, healthy in faith, love, patience.”¹⁰ Clearly the word does not carry a stressed importance. Instead, the emphasis is on the participial clause at the end of the statement, which concludes with a Paulinist triad of “faith, love, patience.”

(4) *Titus 2:6–8*: The intransitive verb *σωφρονεῖν* occurs in Titus 2:6–8, where the author is instructing “Titus” how to teach the younger men:

The younger men likewise exhort to be *sōphrōn*, by offering yourself in all respects as an example of good works, being sound in the teaching, [having] dignity, beyond reproach in the healthy teaching, so that the opponent might be put to shame, having nothing base to say about us.

⁸ See Table C: *Virtues and Vices* as qualifications in Chapter Seven.

⁹ The parallels are significant, seen in the similar words (e.g., *μὴ πλῆκτης*, *μὴ πλῆκτον*, *μὴ πλῆκτον*), as well as a similar order of terms.

¹⁰ The verse hangs upon the previous verse, which says: *Σὺ δὲ λάλει & πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ*. In 2:2, the *ὑγιαίνοντας* reiterates the “healthy teaching” of 2:1.

Here “*to be sōphrōn*” has a place of prominence that is lacking in the three previously-mentioned uses of the adjective for men. It is the first thing that “Titus” is supposed to exhort the younger men to become, and thus it acts as a sort of “heading” for the rest of the instruction. In fact, this is the only instruction Titus is commanded to give to the younger men, although his example does have an educational content. The word “likewise” (ὡσαύτως) may refer back either to the general command to Titus to give “healthy teaching,” since he has not been directly addressed since 2:1 (in the imperative form: Σὺ δὲ λάλει ᾧ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ). Such “healthiness” in teaching linguistically connects Titus, the older men (2:2) and the younger men (2:8), and passively excludes both older and younger women. Or alternatively, ὡσαύτως could link the younger men with the younger women who need to be instructed in *sōphrosynē*, signaling that younger persons were thought to be more in need of obtaining this virtue. Such a conclusion is supported by the phrase παρακάλει σωφρονεῖν, where the intransitive σωφρονεῖν approaches the force of the transitive σωφρονίζειν in 2:4.

Comparison of Masculine and Feminine Sōphrosynē in the Pastorals

In the Pastorals, while *sōphrosynē* is advised for both women and men (younger and older), the author’s perceptions of that virtue reveal some sex-based differences. The masculine aspect of being *sōphrōn* is connected to the (male-only) position of *episkopos* in two instances (1Tim 3:2, and Titus 1:8). It is then urged in the instructions grouped by age and sex in Titus 2, for both older and younger men (as it is for older and younger women), but, in general, *sōphrosynē* for Christian men is not given as much direct attention as it is for Christian women. By contrast, the author of the Pastorals describes *sōphrosynē* for women in more detail, so that it becomes the umbrella virtue for his teachings directed toward women. In 1Tim 2:9–3:1a, it is explicitly linked to a woman’s bodily adornment, her silence and subordination, her position as a learner (and not as a teacher), and her roles as wife and mother. In Titus 2:3–5, the older women’s *sōphrōn* quality is to be passed on to younger women, who then will demonstrate their own apprehension of that virtue in their actions toward husbands, children, housework, and, again, in subordination.

That these are particularly feminine enactments of *sōphrosynē* may also be demonstrated by what is lacking in the author’s “healthy teaching” for men in this regard. Certainly no man is exhorted about his clothing, hair-style, or jewelry. No older, free/freed man is ever told to be silent or sub-

ordinate to anyone in the community.¹¹ The only restriction, and admittedly a significant one, on men's speech is that the content of their speech concurs with the "healthy teaching." No man is ever commanded *a priori* not to teach nor to have authority: a man may aspire to the church offices based on the delineated standards of character and social situation.¹² And, unlike the women, who are specifically instructed about how to behave in their marriages (to be loving, to be subordinate), no man is given any such advice.¹³ While the prerequisite for church office is that a man will be "husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2; 3:13; Titus 1:6), in the Pastorals no man is ever instructed to *get married*, as "Paul" commands the younger widows in 1 Tim 5:14.¹⁴

Some of the sex-based differences are more subtly perceived. For instance, although both women and men are instructed to act in accordance with their household roles, male bishops and deacons are viewed as having a higher "managerial" position in relation to their children (προΐστημι),¹⁵ while the mother's role is described as "child-bearing" (τεκνογονία, 1 Tim 2:15; τεκνογονεῖν, 5:14), "childrearing" (τεκνοτροφεῖν, 1 Tim 5:10), and "child-loving"

¹¹ Two qualifications might be made to this statement: in 1 Tim 2:2b, the whole audience of men and women is included in the statement: "so that *we* might lead a tranquil and *restful* life in all piety and dignity" (ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι). As to the "subordination," some male children (of indeterminate age) are presumably among those who are in subordination to their bishop-fathers whose qualifications are described in 1 Tim 3:4.

¹² In fact, a man is commended for seeking one church office, 1 Tim 3:1b.

¹³ In 1 Tim 4:3, certain "liars" "forbid marriage," a teaching the author counters with "every creation of God is good, and nothing should be rejected when received with thanksgiving." The implication here is that marriage is good for everyone, male and female. Still, marriage is not proffered as the precise solution for men's immorality as it is for that of women.

¹⁴ One wonders whether Timothy and Titus as "young men" were thought to have been already married, or if the author had no information on their marital status, or if their position as apostolic delegates (Paul's real children, γνησίῳ τέκνῳ, 1 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4) meant that they remained, like Paul, unmarried. Neither are men told to "love their children," as with the younger women in Titus 2:4. All this, of course, highlights the Pastorals' lack of reciprocal directives to spouses which are so prominent in Col 3:19 and Eph 5:25–33, where husbands are told to love their wives; likewise, fathers and slave-masters receive exhortation in those two household codes.

¹⁵ A bishop is mentioned twice in this regard: "presiding well over his own household, having children in subordination with all dignity," 1 Tim 3:4. Likewise, the deacons in 1 Tim 3:12 are to "preside well over children and their own households." The obedience of children is emphasized again in the qualifications for bishop in Titus 1:6b: "having faithful children, who are not charged with debauchery or disorderliness." In addition, two vice lists mention disobedience/disorderliness: "disobedient to parents," γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς (2 Tim 3:2), and "many are disorderly," Εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀνυπότακτοι (Titus 1:10).

(φιλότεκνος; Titus 2:5). Another difference arises for men's and women's domestic roles: the "presiding" role recommended for male bishops and deacons extends to their whole household (which presumably includes their slaves),¹⁶ and even beyond that, to the house church modeled on the household. On the other hand, given that the woman's role in the *household* is called οἰκουργός, and the author wants the younger widows "to manage a household" (οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, 1Tim 5:14), the *house church* roles prescribed for women parallel their roles in the household, so that women are subordinated to men in both arenas, and are excluded from the house church leadership positions of overseer, elder, and deacon. Even when the author is unclear, as in 1Tim 3:11 where it is difficult to determine if the "women" are female deacons or the wives of male deacons, the women's "job prerequisites" are enclosed structurally within those for male deacons. Similarly, while older widows receiving community support may have had some official form of a prayer ministry, 1Tim 5:3–16 focuses on which widows qualify for financial assistance, and not explicitly on any office of "widow."

Furthermore, although some of the terms that appear in proximity to *sōphrosynē*—references to the οἶκος, κόσμος, φιλ- compounds, and the triads of "faith, love, and holiness/patience"—are the same for both men and women, they nonetheless underline the gender-differentiated understanding of that virtue in the Pastorals.

(1) Where οἰκο- terms are connected to *sōphrosynē* (1Tim 3:1b–5, in the requirements for the office of overseer; Titus 2:4b–5, for younger women), this is indicative of how the Pastorals commonly described persons in terms of their positions in their households, with the result that sex-specific household roles are carried over into the assembly. In fact, the prevalence of such οἰκο- terms may undoubtedly be explained by the author's conception of the household as ecclesiological metaphor for the Christian assembly.¹⁷ There-

¹⁶ The author twice addresses the behavior of slaves in some detail (1Tim 6:1–2; Titus 2:9–10), but, again, there is no reciprocal instruction to "masters" as in the Haustafeln of Eph 6:9 and Col 4:1.

¹⁷ On this point, see Verner who argues, based on 1Tim 3:14–15, that the author has a "coherent concept of the church as the household of God" (*Household of God*, 1). Verner continues: "This concept is two-pronged, informing the author's understanding both of the household as the basic social unit in the church, and of the church as a social structure modeled on the household" (ibid.). Wagener extends Verner's fundamental perception, saying that the οἶκος is the "ekklesiologischen Leitmetapher" for the author (*Die Ordnung*, 65). Or, as she correctly concludes, that "die Rede vom οἶκος θεοῦ an der zentralen Stelle 1Tim 3:15 nicht nur eine ekklesiologische Metapher darstellt, sondern die Beziehungen in der Gemeinde

fore, the gender-differentiated conception of the domestic community leads to the same social patterning in the Christian community. This process is further reinforced by instructions that remind the audience of the household roles of various persons, such as when the author states that “she will be saved through child-bearing” (1 Tim 2:15), or “let a deacon be husband of one wife, presiding well over children and his own household” (1 Tim 3:12).¹⁸ This gendering of the assembly as a Roman household is concisely represented in the statement of 1 Tim 5:1–2, where “Timothy” is told to treat the older men as fathers, the younger men as brothers, the older women as mothers, and the younger women as sisters.

(2) The word κόσμιος (for women’s clothing, 1 Tim 2:9; for bishops, 3:2) is closely related to *sōphrosynē* in conception and usage. As Wagener points out:

Es handelt sich um einen griechischen Tugendbegriff, der schon in der klassischen Literatur den wahrhaft gesitteten Menschen bezeichnet: die κοσμιότης ist Gegenbegriff zur ἀκολασία und wird häufig mit σωφροσύνη zusammengestellt Auf dieser Grundlage wird κοσμιότης vorzugsweise zur Tugend der Frauen, erlangt in diesem Zusammenhang eine primär sexuelle Konnotation und bedeutet dann “Keuschheit.”¹⁹

Thus, like *sōphrosynē*, κόσμιος might take on a particular nuance depending upon the sex of the person referred to, and that explains why it is used for both men and women in the Pastorals. In particular, the “coordination” of κόσμιος and αἰδώς (“shame, modesty”) with *sōphrosynē* in 1 Tim 2:9 alludes to women’s sexual behavior. Discussing this motif-complex of κόσμιος, αἰδώς, and σωφροσύνη, Wagener perceives a sexualized meaning for all three: “Wie für die κοσμιότης und αἰδώς gilt nun für die σωφροσύνη, daß sie in der Anwendung auf Frauen sexualitätsbezogene Bedeutung hat.”²⁰ That these three terms are being used in 1 Timothy 2:9 to prescribe women’s *sexual*

faktisch strukturieren soll; das Konzept hat also präskriptiven Charakter” (ibid., 113). Her conclusions are comprehensive: the functions of church leader parallel those of male heads-of-households (ibid.).

¹⁸ This verse encapsulates the three roles of male head-of-household, as husband, father, and master.

¹⁹ Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 78–79.

²⁰ Ibid., 81. Of αἰδώς: “Bei Anwendung auf Frauen bezieht sich der Begriff [αἰδώς] besonders auf den sexuelle Bereich; als ‘Schamgefühl’ (vgl. lat. pudor), das sich insbesondere in der Zurückhaltung gegenüber fremden Männern zeigt, sichert die αἰδώς die sexuelle Unberührtheit der Mädchen und die eheliche Treue der Frau” (ibid., 79).

behavior, especially their marital faithfulness, is suggested by a similar use in *Melissa to Kleareta*:

For the married woman is to appear fair of form to her own husband, but not to the neighbors. On the one hand, you should have a blush as a sign of modesty [αἰδώς] on your face instead of rouge, and, on the other, goodness and the height of decorum [κοσμιότατα] and *sōphrosynē* instead of gold and emeralds (lines 12–17).

Similarly, *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman* begins by linking *kosmia* with *sōphrosynē* and marriage: “In sum, it is necessary for a *good woman* also to be well-behaved [κοσμίαν]; for without virtue she might never become such ... and the supreme virtue of a woman is *sōphrosynē*; for by this [virtue] she will be able both to honor and to love her own husband.”²¹ The author of the Pastorals has imbibed such a gender ideology, and, by employing these terms together, has evoked “the good woman” *topos*.

(3) Compounds with the suffix φιλ- are common in the Pastorals,²² and are twice used in proximity to *sōphro*- words for both men (Titus 1:7) and women (Titus 2:4). It is highly significant that the younger women are given more definitive (more familial) objects for their φιλη (husband [φιλάνδρους] and children [φιλοτέκνους]), while the bishop may extend his care into the larger world (toward guests [φιλόξενον], and toward the good [φιλάγαθον]).²³ More

²¹ Τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀγαθὸν δεῖ ἡμεν καὶ κοσμίαν, ἀνευ γὰρ ἀρετᾶς οὐδέποκα γένοιτό τις τοιαύτα γυναικὸς δὲ μάλιστα ἀρετὰ σωφροσύνα διὰ γὰρ ταύτας τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀγαπήν δυνασέεται, Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61 (588, lines 19–20, and 589, lines 1–3). Wagener notes that the use of these terms in 1 Tim 2:9 is fully consistent with the concepts in *Melissa to Kleareta*, *On the Harmony of a Woman* (by Periktione) and *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman* (by Phintys) (*Die Ordnung*, 84).

²² The author uses other φιλ- compounds: φιλαργυρία (famously in 1 Tim 6:10); φιλαυτοί, φιλάργυροι (one right after the other as vices of opponents in 2 Tim 3:2); φιλήθονοι (opposed to φιλόθεοι, 2 Tim 3:4); and φιλανθρωπία (“of our savior God” in Titus 3:4). On these terms, see Quinn (*Letter to Titus*, 80–81, 90–91) who also comments there on the words φιλόξενον, φιλάγαθον in Titus 1:8. On φιλάνδρια and φιλοτεκνία, see also Dibelius and Conzelmann (*Pastoral Epistles*, 140, esp. nn. 10, 11). Spicq refers to other primary sources for φιλάγαθος, φιλάνδρους, and φιλοτέκνους (*Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 392–394, 604, 620).

²³ On the other hand, the enrolled older widows are also to be hospitable: ἐξενδοχίσηεν (1 Tim 5:10); ξενοδοχέω is a later form of ξενοδοκέω “entertain guests or strangers,” BDAG, s.v. ξενοδοκέω. In the Roman Empire, there must have been social expectations about masculine and feminine roles in offering hospitality. For instance, did the male head of household extend an invitation to guests, while women tended to the details of providing the hospitality? Janet H. Tulloch’s study suggests that was the case for Roman funerary banquets: “... the task of caring for the dead fell to the survivors. Sons were ultimately responsible for the cult of their parents, but the actual management of the funerary meals consumed at the tomb fell

likely, the author simply has an affinity for such terms, and employs them without any gendered connotations in mind.

(4) Two instances of *sōphrōn* language are accompanied by similar virtue-triads, one applied to women and one to men. With respect to women, the second half of 1 Timothy 2:15 stands as the protasis of a conditional sentence: “If they remain in *faith* and in *love* and in *holiness* with *sōphrosynē*.” On the other hand, Titus 2:2 gives instructions to (older) men using a triad with the same first two words (and also in the dative, although with the definite article and asyndetic): “older men are to be sober, dignified, *sōphrōn*, healthy in *faith*, in *love*, in *patience*.”²⁴ Beyond the author’s pseudepigraphical interest in drawing upon the triad form that appears in Pauline letters, is there any significance to his substitutions of ὑπομονή and ἁγιασμός to the formulation? Quinn appears to think not, since “the triad is by no means stereotyped in its seven Pauline occurrences outside the PE, for there is an oscillation between hope and steadfastness (cf. 1 Thess 1:3 with 5:8) as well as variety in the order of the terms. Already in Rom 5:1–5 the basic triad is being glossed with other virtues”²⁵ But Quinn only comments on ὑπομονή where it appears in Titus, and not on the combination with ἁγιασμός found in 1 Timothy.

According to Wagener, ἁγιος-terms have acquired a sexual connotation in at least two of the Pauline letters.²⁶ In the first example, Paul exhorts the Thessalonian Christian men in a somewhat elliptical fashion:

For this is the will of God, your holiness (ἁγιασμός, i.e., sanctification): that you refrain from *porneia*, that each of you know [how] to acquire his own vessel in holiness (ἁγιασμός) and honor, not in passion of desire as also the nations who do not know God; not to transgress and defraud his brother in the matter.

to the primary caregivers of the living—the women of the family” (“Women Leaders in Family Funeral Banquets,” in Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald, *A Woman’s Place*, 169). However, such gender-differentiated practices are not fully explained in early Christian sources, including the Pastorals.

²⁴ This verse has an echo in 1 Tim 6:11b, where Timothy is told to “Pursue righteousness, piety, faith, love, endurance, gentleness,” δίδωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, εὐσέβειαν, πίστιν, ἀγάπην, ὑπομονήν, πραΰτητα.

²⁵ Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 132–134. See also the brief discussion in Wagener, who notes that “faith” and “love” are used consistently together in the Pastorals, with differing third elements (*Die Ordnung*, 109).

²⁶ *Die Ordnung*, 109. It seems to me that these uses of “holiness” might also have influenced the Pastorals’ author in his command to Timothy in 1 Tim 5:2 to exhort “the younger women as sisters in all purity [ἀγνεία].”

Although the exact meaning of this teaching is uncertain,²⁷ it is clear that Paul here understands in part a sexual connotation to the word ἁγιασμός.²⁸ It seems, too, that the command is directed toward men,²⁹ and that it has something to do with married sexuality: that is, a man's faithful and proper relationship with his wife (and possibly with refraining from improper relations with another believer's wife, daughter, or even his slave).

In 1 Corinthians 7:34–35, a Pauline teaching on holiness is directed toward women:

I wish you to be free from care.
 The unmarried man cares for the things of the Lord,
 how he might please the Lord.
 But the married man cares for the things of the world,
 how he may please his wife, and he stands divided.
 And the unmarried woman and the virgin cares for the things of the Lord,
 in order that she might be holy (ἁγία) both in body and in spirit.
 But the married woman cares for the things of the world,
 how she may please her husband.
 I say this for your own benefit, not that I might lay a restraint on you,

²⁷ Malherbe remarks on the phrase εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκευὸς κτᾶσθαι, "This is one of the most disputed texts in the entire letter. The difficulties revolve around the meanings of *ktāsthai* and of *skeuos*. The verb is used of marriage, e.g., by Musonius Rufus (Fr. 12 [86, 7 Lutz]), of 'a woman who has a lawful husband' (*kektēmenē andra nomimon*). However, its meaning, which in the present generally is 'to acquire,' 'to get,' is here determined by how *skeuos* ('vessel') is understood. *Skeuos* is used figuratively here, as it is elsewhere in Paul (Rom 9:21, 22, 23; 2 Cor 4:7; cf. 2 Tim 2:20, 21; Heb 9:21) (*The Letters to the Thessalonians* [AB 32B; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 226). Malherbe opts for the translation "to take a wife for himself" (also, supported by some patristic commentators): "The exact phrase *skeuos ktāsthai* does not occur anywhere else in Greek literature, but there is evidence that Hebrew usage that had to do with marriage and sexual relations influenced Paul's choice of words, which are also similar to other Greek formulations ..." (ibid., 227). Glancy claims that *σκευός* connotes a female slave, and that "Paul's advice could be construed as instructions to the male Thessalonian Christians to find morally neutral outlets for their sexual urges. And in the first century, domestic slaves were considered to be morally neutral outlets for sexual urges—vessels, we might say" (*Slavery in Early Christianity*, 60). I think her view of Paul's moral stance on sexual ethics is hard to maintain when reading 1 Corinthians 5–7 and Romans 1–2; for Paul, sexual intercourse is never "morally neutral."

²⁸ But see also 1 Thess 3:13, where ἁγιοσύνη is used more generally: "... in order to strengthen your hearts blameless in holiness before our God and father at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his holy ones, amen," εἰς τὸ στηριξαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἁγιοσύνῃ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, ἀμήν.

²⁹ Ascough argues from this evidence that most of the members of the Thessalonian assembly were male, and thinks that *σκευός* refers to "male genitalia" (*Paul's Macedonian Associations*, 187–189).

but with an eye to good order and devotion to the Lord without distraction.³⁰

In a clause that breaks the otherwise fairly parallel construction of the teaching,³¹ the adjective ἅγιος is applied to unmarried and virgin Christian women (v. 34). Somehow their status as persons abstaining from marital sex translates into being “holy” (both in body and in spirit).³²

For anyone attempting to read Paul’s letter collection in a systematic way, herein lies an apparent contradiction: while “holiness” has sexual connotations both for believing men in 1Thess 4:3–7 and for believing women in 1Cor 7:32–35, the recommendations for “holiness” are different, and even opposite: the Thessalonian men are to practice holiness by *being faithful within their marriages*, while the unmarried Corinthian women will be holy if they *abstain from marriage*.³³ Paul’s teaching in 1Cor 7:14 might be thought to further confound the relationship between holiness and marital relations: “For the unbelieving husband has been made holy [ἡγιάσται] by the wife and the unbelieving wife has been made holy [ἡγιάσται] by the brother; once your children were unclean, but now they are holy [ἅγια].”³⁴ Within these

³⁰ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι. ὁ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ κυρίῳ· ὁ δὲ γαμήσας μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ μεμέρισται. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡ ἅγια καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρί. τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν σύμφορον λέγω, οὐχ ἵνα βρόχον ὑμῖν ἐπιβάλλω ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον καὶ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως, 1Cor 7:32–35. On the philosophical debate behind Paul’s argument here, see again Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, 47–84.

³¹ The other break in parallelism is the addition of καὶ μεμέρισται at the end of the description of the married man (v. 34a).

³² Merz concludes from 1Cor 7:34 that, even though Paul does not explicitly establish marital sex as an obstacle to the Christian life, he is closer to affirming the idea of women’s ascetic practices, because “die Heiligkeit an Körper und Geist ursächlich ... mit dem Verzicht auf Sexualität zusammenhängt ...” (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 355).

³³ Antoinette Clark Wire posits that the prophesying women in the Corinthian assembly “... may have practiced sexual abstinence to predispose them for communion with God” (*The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul’s Rhetoric* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 83). According to Wire, Paul would have agreed with that practice in theory, since he allows that marital sexual abstinence may be allowed for seasons of prayer (1Cor 7:5; *ibid.*). Thus, Paul is treading carefully in his rhetoric: instead of advocating that women pursue the holiness of body and spirit that comes from being unmarried, Paul is rather trying to persuade women to surrender the possibility of consecration (*ibid.*, 90–93). While I am not wholly convinced by Wire’s argument that these verses demonstrate Paul’s double standard for sexual ethics for men and women, the fact that the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7 remains so contested shows again why the author of the Pastorals wanted to “clarify” Paul’s teachings on the roles of women in the church.

³⁴ ἡγιάσται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί καὶ ἡγιάσται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκαθάρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἅγια ἐστιν.

marriages, “holiness” evidently spreads from the believing spouse to the unbelieving partner, extending even to their children.³⁵ According to Paul in 1 Corinthians 7, believing women may acquire holiness either through marriage, *or* through abstaining from marriage. However, Paul says he would prefer it if believers would remain unmarried, if they have the opportunity and the God-given capacity for it: “I wish all people to be as I myself am; but each has his or her own gift from God, one this way, and one that way. I say to the unmarried and to the widows, it is good for them if they remain as I also am.”³⁶

When one reads the Pauline letter collection as a set of definitive texts that are mutually interpreting, these statements seem confusing and even contradictory. This is the situation that confronted the author of the Pastorals and prompted him to clarify (to “correct”) Paul’s stand. He does this by soundly rejecting the option of sexual abstinence while establishing the necessity of marriage and marital fidelity for both women and men.³⁷ Thus, in 1Tim 2:15 the woman’s ἀγιασμός, not to mention her salvation, is only obtained through *participating in*, rather than *abstaining from*, marital sex (with its hoped-for outcome of children). Consequently, a female believer’s *sōphrosynē* is demonstrated first and foremost by means of her remaining sexually faithful to her husband, and this virtue has now become the equivalent of “holiness” and “salvation” for a Christian wife.

In summary, while some terminology related to both male and female *sōphrosynē* in the Pastorals—references to the οἶκος, κόσμος, φιλ- compounds, and the triads of “faith, love, and holiness/patience”—makes the instructions appear less sex-specified, a closer inspection reveals a sometimes subtle gendering of the concepts. The words are similar, but they have

³⁵ For Paul, the spread of “holiness” is restricted to faithful married couples, as confirmed by his discussion of the negative consequences that occur when a man participates in sexual relations with a πόρνη in 1 Cor 6:15–18. Cf. also Rom 7:1–3 where Paul supports his discussion of the legitimacy of the law with an example of a woman’s marital fidelity.

³⁶ θέλω δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν· ἀλλὰ ἕκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ, ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως. λέγω δὲ τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις, καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἔάν μείνωσιν ὡς καὶ ἐγώ, 1 Cor 7:7–8. Later Paul summarizes, “Therefore, the one who marries [or: gives in marriage] his own virgin does well, and the one who does not marry [or: give in marriage] will do better,” ὥστε καὶ ὁ γαμίζων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον καλῶς ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ μὴ γαμίζων κρεῖσσον ποιήσει, 1 Cor 7:38. He also advises widows to remain unmarried, saying they will be “more blessed” (μακαριωτέρα) if they do, 1 Cor 7:39–40.

³⁷ He asserts a comparable moral standard of faithful sexual intercourse only within marriage for both men *and* women. This comparable expectation of fidelity for both husbands and wives contrasts with the world-weary realization in *Theano to Nikostrate* (and other texts) that husbands will probably carry on extra-marital affairs.

different meanings when urged upon women and men, meanings that are rooted, of course, in the literary backgrounds, social context, and ideological (Pauline and moral-philosophical) assumptions of the Pastorals.

The author's broad importation and use of σωφρο- compounds demonstrate his overall interest in delivering moral exhortation for his communities, while his conventional views on masculinity and femininity lead to a gendered "curricular content" for his exhortation. *Sōphrosynē* for men means sexual self-control,³⁸ but also has other meanings of mental health and moderate living. However, as in *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, *sōphrosynē* for a woman is a sexualized virtue, referring to her ability to maintain self-control of her bodily desires by practicing faithfulness within marriage. Like author of *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate*, the Pastorals' author views "women alone" with uneasiness (1 Tim 5:6, 11–15; cf. 4:1–5); therefore, all women in his audience must enact *sōphrosynē* (Titus 2:3–5). In his efforts to provide "healthy teaching," he evokes the *topos* of women's morality—that section of the cognitive map that links to other and related *topoi*. However, he does not treat the *topos* at length, as do the Pythagorean women's letters; instead, he allows a few words and phrases to stand as an ἐπιτομή of the *topos*. This *epitome* then leads the reader's mind across the map of the *topos*, without having to rehearse all the details along the way. Furthermore, the author has modified the *topos* when he draws upon Christian, and especially some Pauline, constructions and justifications for his teachings. His concept of feminine *sōphrosynē* picks up the following specific elements: modest adornment and speech, as well as the three prescribed household roles (wife, mother, *despoina*), all of which have already been explored in the Pythagorean letters.

³⁸ The author may show some vague concern about men's "lust" in three vice lists: the "sexually immoral," πόρνοις, 1 Tim 1:9–10; "lovers of pleasure," φιλήδονοι, 2 Tim 4:4; and those "enslaved to various desires and pleasures," δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις, Titus 3:3. (Yet the contexts of these lists show that they might refer to men and/or women, even though the terms are in the masculine gender.) There is also a hint of a connection between false teaching and corrupting seduction in 2 Tim 3:6. But the author most often identifies masculine immorality as improper speech-acts, and his opponents as those who are involved not in sexual immorality, but in sins of speaking and/or teaching wrongly (1 Tim 1:3–7, 18–20; 4:1–3; 6:3–5; 2 Tim 2:14, 16–18, 23–26; 3:6–7, 13; 4:3–4; Titus 1:10–14; 3:9–11). In fact, some (male?) opponents evidently advocate sexual celibacy, since they "forbid marrying," καλυπόντων γαμεῖν (1 Tim 4:3).

MODEST DEPORTMENT (ADORNMENT AND SPEECH)

In 1Tim 2:9–10, the author moralizes that a believing woman's modest deportment—how she *appears* in the presence of others—stands as a key manifestation of her *sōphrosynē*:

Likewise also [I wish] women to adorn themselves in decorous bearing with modesty and *sōphrosynē*, not in braided hair and gold or pearls or expensive clothing, but what is proper for women who profess godly-piety, through good works. Let a woman learn in silence in all subordination; but I do not permit a woman to teach, or to have authority over a man, but to remain silent.

The Pastorals contain just this one reference to this element of “the good woman” *topos*. Nonetheless, since a *topos* exists in a “cognitive space” and “depends upon, and expresses, a cultural consensus,”³⁹ those familiar with a culture may extract and extrapolate from just an abbreviated statement of one element of the *topos*. Consequently, the verses from 1 Timothy carry more allusive effect than may first be apparent. Five elements arise in the short statement in 1 Timothy that appear in other treatments of women's deportment:

(1) The use of κόσμ—cognates linking a woman's *sōphrosynē* and adornment is a shared feature of texts such as *Melissa to Kleareta*, the treatises attributed to Periktione and Phintys, and, I would add, Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* (10.2–13), and Plutarch's *Advice to the Bride and Groom* (*Mor.* 141D–E [26]; 144E [46]) as well. By linking adornment with the child-bearing role (2:9 and 2:15), the author echoes a statement from *On the Sōphrosynē* which equates “the most beautiful adornment of a free woman” (κάλλιστος δὲ κόσμος γυναικὸς ἐλευθέρας) with her reproduction of children who look like her husband.⁴⁰

(2) The 1 Timothy exhortation prescribes what is suitable “moral” (rather than *literal*) adornment, beginning with “decorous bearing with modesty and *sōphrosynē*,” a common expectation in many texts, as has been described above.

(3) Next, the Pastorals' author lays out the antithesis of such adornment, that is, how *not* to adorn oneself: he rejects elaborate hairstyles,⁴¹ expensive

³⁹ Thom, “The Mind is its Own Place,” 566.

⁴⁰ Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a (W.-H. 591).

⁴¹ Both 1 Timothy and 1 Peter proscribe *braided* hair, an injunction missing from *Melissa to Kleareta*. Still this is one aspect of the *topos*: Periktione's *On the Harmony* also states

jewelry, and extravagant clothing (while omitting cosmetics, ointments, and comestibles) as three typically “immoral” adornments for women.⁴² In addition to advice on make-up,⁴³ *Melissa to Kleareta* has expanded the proscribed clothing to include that which is “very expensive or excessive; for she ought to reject garments of purple cloth, and that shot through with purple and gold” (lines 8–10).⁴⁴

(4) 1Tim 2:10–11 sets out the “positive” way for Christian women to be adorned: “but what is proper for women who profess godly piety, through good works.”⁴⁵ What counts as “good works” for Christian women is to be found throughout the remainder of the author’s instructions for women, especially in the fulfillment of women’s household roles. His connection between actual bodily adornment and godly deeds, shows his dependence on the popular moral concept that one’s outer appearance makes one’s inner character visible. In addition, the author evokes the recognized metaphor of taking off vice and putting on virtue. Still, the linking of a woman’s adornment to her manifestation of religious piety is a distinctive feature of the

that women should avoid “braiding the hair in an artful way,” πλέζεται πολυτεχνίησι τρίχας (Stob. *Anth.* 4.28.19 [W.-H. 690.12–13]). However, some braiding was evidently a requirement for a proper married woman. For more details on women’s hairstyles and their meaning, see: Cynthia L. Thompson, “Hairstyles, Head-covering, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth,” *Biblical Archaeologist*, June 1988: 99–115; Judith Lynn Sebasta, “Symbolism in the Costume of the Roman Woman,” in *The World of Roman Costume* (eds. Judith Lynn Sebasta and Larissa Bonfante; Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1994), 46–53; Charles H. Cosgrove, “A Woman’s Unbound Hair in the Greco-Roman World, with Special Reference to the Story of the ‘Sinful Woman’ in Luke 7:36–50,” *JBL* 124.4 [2005], 675–692; Elaine Fantham, “Covering the Head at Rome: Ritual and Gender,” in *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture* (eds. J.C. Edmondson and Alison Keith; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 158–171; Kelly Olson, *Dress and The Roman Woman: Self-presentation and Society* (New York: Routledge, 2008); and my own “Epitomizing Virtue: Clothing the Christian Woman’s Body,” in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Essays on Early Christian Concepts of Personhood* (eds. Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 261–281.

⁴² The Pastorals’ threesome is very closely related to that of 1Peter 3:3–4. For the possible literary relationships between these two NT passages, see Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 78–89; also, Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 276 (with n. 29). On the passage from 1Peter 3, see Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive*, esp. ch. 6. So many common references to avoid expensive personal items shows the very negative connotation placed on ostentatious displays of wealth.

⁴³ The treatises *On the Harmony* and *On the Sôphrosynê* both also advise against make-up, as does Xenophon, *Oec.* 10.2–13.

⁴⁴ For more information about women’s clothing and adornment, see Chapter Four above, on the subject matter of *Melissa to Kleareta*.

⁴⁵ On Christian women’s good works, see Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 86–88; and Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 274–277. Note also 1Tim 5:10, where a requirement for enrolling an older widow is “attested by good works,” and 5:11, “if she was devoted to every good work.”

Pastorals' instruction. The treatises by Periktione and Phintys do advise a woman how to properly worship the gods, but do not overtly connect this to adornment, while *Melissa to Kleareta* makes no mention of religion whatsoever.

(5) The author's insistence that women maintain a demeanor of ἡσυχία (twice in 1 Tim 2:11–12)⁴⁶ directly parallels that of *Melissa to Kleareta*, where a good wife ought to be “adorned with silence” (ἄσυχία κεκαλλωπισμέναν, line 6).⁴⁷

By incorporating just these five elements of “the good woman” *topos*, the author begins to assemble an *epitome* for the moral training of Christian women, a model that would have sounded culturally familiar to his audience. Still his depiction of putting on “good works” (ἔργα ἀγαθὰ; elsewhere in the Pastorals also called ἔργα καλὰ) as a form of virtuous adornment differs in construction from the advice found in the non-Christian texts.⁴⁸ The

⁴⁶ Focusing on gossip, Bjelland Kartzow investigates the various teachings on right and wrong speech in the Pastorals, demonstrating convincingly that both males and females could transgress gender expectations in their manner of speaking (*Gossip and Gender*, 29–34, 178–201).

⁴⁷ I give reasons for adopting this phrase over against Städele's reading in Chapter One, n. 114. In *A Consolation to His Wife*, Plutarch likewise places ἡσυχία in close proximity to σωφρόν and κοσμ- cognates in describing his wife's response to their son's death: there was “... such peace ... and quiet ... so soberly had you ordered the household at a time which gave so much license for disorder,” πολλὴν κατὰστασιν ... καὶ ἡσυχίαν ... οὕτω σωφρόνως κατεκόσμησας τὸν οἶκον ἐν καιρῷ πολλὴν ἀκοσμίας ἐξουσίαν διδόντι, *Mor.* 609D (trans. Donald Russell, in Pomeroy, *Plutarch's "Advice to the Bride and Groom"*). In his *Advice*, Plutarch advises: “sensible wives keep quiet when their husbands shout in anger ...,” αἱ δὲ νοῦν ἔχουσαι γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ὀργαῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν κεκραγόντων μὲν ἡσυχάζουσι, *Advice, Mor.* 143C (trans. D. Russell). He also uses vocabulary from the σιωπ- group (*Advice, Mor.* 142D [32]; 143C [37]). One other woman from Plutarch's work displays the desirable quality of ἡσυχία, and that is Aretaphila of Cyrene (born ca. 50 BCE). After she had contrived to subvert the rule of the tyrant Nikokrates and then his brother Leander and thus gained freedom for her city, she “spent the rest of her life quietly at the loom in the company of her friends and family,” τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἐν ἰστοῖς ἡσυχίαν ἄγουσα μετὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ οἰκείων διετέλεσεν (*Mulierum virtutes, Mor.* 257E).

⁴⁸ Merz observes that in Periktione's *On the Harmony* “good works” are mentioned as the *outcomes* of women's proper adornment, rather than as adornments themselves (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 275). *On the Harmony* states that: “One should consider the harmonious woman full of prudence and *sōphrosynē*, for surely a soul must live for virtue, so that she will be just and brave, and being prudent and beautifying herself in contentment, and hating empty glory. For from these things, good works [ἔργματα καλὰ] come to a woman, for herself and husband and children and household, perhaps even for her city, if indeed such a woman governs cities or peoples,” Τὴν ἀρμονίην γυναῖκα νώσασθαι δεῖ φρονήσιός τε καὶ σωφροσύνης πλείην· κάρτα γὰρ ψυχὴν πεπνύσθαι δεῖ εἰς ἀρετὴν, ὥστ' ἔσται καὶ δικαίη καὶ ἀνδρηγή καὶ φρονέουσα καὶ αὐταρχεῖη καλλυνομένη καὶ κενὴν δόξην μισέουσα. ἐκ τούτων γὰρ ἔργματα καλὰ γίνεται γυναικί

latter sometimes state more concretely what is appropriate dress,⁴⁹ or appeal to what is “natural” for the body.⁵⁰ What Christian women ought to “put on” is not depicted here as morally-correct clothing, nor is it called “natural” (although the author’s appeal to Eve and Adam leads to the idea that “male” and “female” are fundamentally God-created, and thus in a profound way, “natural”). Instead, Christian women must adopt attitudes and behaviors that can be visibly and audibly monitored: the “good works” of silence, subordination to husbands, sexual faithfulness within marriage, childbearing, and household management. All of these “good works” for women have their parallels in the advice given for women in the non-Christian texts, so that in all of this literature, a “good” woman (who is either ἀγαθή and/or καλή) presents herself and her body appropriately within her domestic arena.

The parallels between 1Tim 2:9–10 and the following text from 1Peter demonstrate similar theologizing on this adornment aspect of the *topos*.

Likewise the wives ought to be subordinate to their own husbands, so that even if some of them do not obey the word, through their wives’ behavior they will gain without a word, by observing your behavior in holy fear. Let not your external adornment [κόσμος] be from the braiding [ἐμπλοκή] of hair, and putting on of gold [χρυσίον] or wearing of robes, but let the hidden person of the heart be adorned by the incorruptible quality of a gentle and quiet [ἡσύχιος] spirit, which is great value [πολυτελής] in the sight of God. Thus once also the holy women [ἁγίαι] who had hope in God adorned themselves by being subordinate [ὑποτάσσειν] to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abram calling him lord, whose children you became by doing good and by not letting anything terrify you.⁵¹

ἐς αὐτήν τε καὶ ἄνδρα· καὶ τέκεα καὶ οἶκον· πολλάκις δὲ καὶ πόλει, εἴ γε πόλις ἢ ἔθνη αἱ τοιή γε κρατύνει, Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W.-H. 688.11–689.3).

⁴⁹ On the *Sôphrosynê* briefly states: “[she] must be dressed in white, both simple and without excess,” δεῖ λευχεύμενα εἶναι καὶ ἀπλοικὰ καὶ ἀπερίσσευτον; in clothes “that are moderate and white in color,” μετρίοις καὶ λευκοχρωμάτοις; Stob. 4.23.61a (W.-H. 591, lines 16–17). Compare also Philo’s description of the Therapeutae (men and women) being “clothed in white,” λευχειμονούντες (*Ther.* 66).

⁵⁰ So says *On the Harmony*: “One must train the body to a natural measure,” σκήνος δὲ ἄγειν χρὴ πρὸς μέτρα φύσιος, Stob. *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W.-H. 689.14–15); and, “For the body wants to be neither cold nor naked, for the sake of good seemliness, and it needs nothing else,” σκήνος γὰρ ἐθέλει μὴ ῥιγέειν μηδὲ γυμνὸν εἶναι χάριν εὐπρεπείης, ἄλλου δ’ οὐδενὸς χρήζει, Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 (W.-H. 690.8–10). As we have seen, training the body is also a subject of *Theano to Euboule*, where the children are to become accustomed to temperature extremes.

⁵¹ Ὅμοίως [αἱ] γυναῖκες ὑποτάσσονται τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινας ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθῇσονται ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν. ὦν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος, ἀλλ’ ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής. οὕτως γὰρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἁγίαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι

Both authors combine recognizable elements of the *topos*—attention to hair, jewelry, expensive clothing, and silence—with justifications that draw upon their Christian background. First, they employ interpretative depictions of matriarchs of the Hebrew Bible: Eve with Adam, and Sarah with Abraham.⁵² Second, both depend upon the verb ὑποτάσσειν as the primary prescription for the wife's relationship to her husband.⁵³ Third, in both 1Tim 2:9–10 and 1Peter 3:3–4 there is a move away from the earlier Pauline metaphor of “taking off” the old person, and “putting on” Christ or the new person.⁵⁴ Instead, of a metaphorical clothing of oneself which applies to both male and female believers,⁵⁵ 1 Timothy 2 (and 1 Peter 3), under the influence of “the good woman” *topos* apply the term to women only, and thus change the metaphor: now women must literally “take off,” if not yet “put on,” certain articles of clothing in order to demonstrate their Christian faith.

Woman's adornment also relates to the acquisition of wealth, another concern of the author, at least in 1 Timothy. The issue of the economic status of women arises again directly in the section on enrolling impoverished

εις θεὸν ἐκόσμου ἐαυτάς, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσαν ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιούσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν, 1Peter 3:1–6.

⁵² As discussed in Chapter Two, Theano, Myia, and other philosophical women from the Greek past are lifted up as examples to be imitated, e.g., Plutarch (*Advice, Mor.* 145E–146A) and Clement (*Strom.* 4.19.121–122). The Cynic epistle of Crates to Mnasos names two other Greek women who exemplify proper adornment: “Both Penelope and Alcestis, I think, adorned themselves with it [decorum, κοσμιότης] and even now they are praised and honored for their virtue. In order, then, that you, too, might become like them, try to hold fast to this advice,” ἡ μοι δοκοῦσι καὶ ἡ Πηνελόπη καὶ ἡ Ἀλκίσις κεκοσμηθῆσαι καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐπ’ ἀρετῇ ὑμνεῖσθαι καὶ τιμᾶσθαι. ἴν’ οὖν καὶ σὺ ταύταις ἐνάμιλλος γένη, πειρῶ τούτων ἀντέχεσθαι τῶν παραινουμένων (*Cynic Ep.* 9; trans. Ronald F. Hock, in *The Cynic Epistles*, 61).

⁵³ Plutarch speaks of wives similarly: “If they are subordinate to their husbands, they are praised but if they want to rule, they are more shamed than the ones who are ruled,” ὑποτάττουσαι μὲν γὰρ ἐαυτάς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπαινοῦνται, κρατεῖν δὲ βουλόμεναι μᾶλλον τῶν κρατουμένων ἀσχημονοῦσι (*Advice, Mor.* 142E). Several NT texts apply ὑποτάσσειν and ὑποταγή to wives: 1Cor 14:34; Eph 5:21–22; Col 3:18; 1Tim 2:11; Titus 2:5.

⁵⁴ Nils A. Dahl and David Hellholm identify this idea in Rom 8:29; 13:14; 1Cor 15:42–49; Gal 3:27; Eph 4:22, 24; Phil 3:21; Col 3:9f., among others (“Garment-Metaphors: the Old and the New Human Being,” in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy, Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday* [eds. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2001], 139–158; esp. 144–157).

⁵⁵ This includes the military image of putting on “the whole armor of God” in Eph 6:10–17; cf. 1Thess 5:8. Similarly, the baptismal reference in Gal 3:27–28 includes both sexes: “For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, have put on [ἐνεδύσασθε] Christ; there is not Jew or Greek, there is not slave or free, there is not male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”

widows, where we read, “But the real widow [ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα], even though she has been left alone, has hoped in God [ἤλπικεν ἐπὶ θεόν], and continues in supplications and prayers night and day, but the woman who is living luxuriously, though living [ζῶσα] has died.” (1Tim 5:5–6). The themes of these verses reverberate later in the letter:

Command those who are rich in the present age not to think highly nor to have hope [ἤλπικέναι] in the uncertainty of wealth, but in God [ἐπὶ θεῷ] who supplies us richly with everything for enjoyment, to do good, to be wealthy in good works, to be generous, sharing, storing up treasure for themselves as a good foundation for the coming age, so that they might take hold of the real life [τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς]. (1Tim 6:17–19)

In both places, the Pastorals claim that one must look beyond external indicators of status and wealth toward what is “real,” ὄντως. Throughout, the author sustains the argument that extravagant bodily adornment is not “real,” but that consistent and concrete expressions of faith in God are. The effect is that wealthy Christian women are exhorted to conform to this cultural ideal of the “good woman,” because it has eternal spiritual significance, as well as true “profit” (πορισμός, 1Tim 6:5–6) in the divine “economy” (οἰκονομία, 1Tim 1:4).

GOOD WOMEN: PHILOSOPHERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD

Households and the Pastorals

In the Pastorals, both men and women, leaders and subordinates are enveloped in “household language,” and the position of each person in the domestic household is replicated in some way in the ecclesial “household.” What distinguishes the author’s moral-philosophical instruction for Christian women from that for Christian men is that the domestic household roles of wife, mother, and *despoina* are established as the primary arenas in which Christian women are permitted to enact their faith. They are prohibited from teaching and “having authority” over men (1Tim 2:11), which also signifies that women cannot serve as “the elders who preside well ... who labor in the word and in the teaching.”⁵⁶ They are definitely restricted from the bishops’ “good works” of presiding over communities. While certainly not every man could function as a bishop or elder, nonetheless the potential existed for them to “desire [this] good work” (1Tim 3:1b).

⁵⁶ Οἱ καλῶς προσεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι ... οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1Tim 5:17.

Women, on the other hand, are relegated to the three “real-life” positions of wife, mother and *despoina*. While the author develops the male domestic roles of husband, father, and *despotēs* into the offices of the overseer (1 Tim 3:1b–5) and elder (Titus 1:5–9), the female responsibilities have no official counterparts in his familial system of church organization. The widows are not yet established as a service group of sorts, as in later decades, nor is there a clear outline for the activities assigned to female deacons.⁵⁷ Unlike the “good work” of the male overseer, the “good works” potentially open to women are those endorsed for the older widows in 1 Tim 5: “a wife of one husband, attested by *good works*: if she raised children, if she showed hospitality, if she washed the saints’ feet, if she helped the afflicted, if she was devoted to every *good work*.” The author seems especially suspicious of younger women’s activities, and urgently commands them to take up their proper positions within their own households (1 Tim 5:11–15).

As we have seen in the Pythagorean letters, especially the letters attributed to Theano, the three household roles prescribed in “the good woman” *topos* correspond to those for men found in Aristotle’s *Politics* and elsewhere. However, unlike male heads-of-households, women had no further approved social arenas in which to function and contribute: not in politics, the military, the marketplace. This prohibition is extended by to the Pastorals, so that women cannot take on leadership roles in the assemblies of God. The one exception to this blanket prohibition was the subordinated teaching role allotted to older women for the socially conventional instruction of younger women in Titus 2:3–5. Here the topics of their teaching differ from the theological matters that male teachers convey to the community as a whole, so that in the case of older female teachers, the traditional moral-philosophical content, that is, the elements of the larger *topos* of “the good woman,” serves only to reinforce the Pastorals’ *Lehrverbot*, and therefore limits women’s activities to the world of the household.

Wife

I have argued that throughout the ancient sources a woman’s *sōphrosynē* is first and foremost exhibited in her role as wife, and in particular, in her duty to remain sexually faithful to “her own husband.”⁵⁸ Additional prescriptions

⁵⁷ See my analyses of 1 Tim 3:11 and 5:3–16 in Chapter Seven.

⁵⁸ Titus 2:5 has τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν. Periktione uses the phrase τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἑαυτῆς (Stob., *Anth.* 4.28.19 [W.-H. 691.15]), and Phintys, τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα (Stob., *Anth.* 4.61 [W.-H. 589.2–3]). Musonius also connects *sōphrosynē* with a woman’s “lawful” sexual practice, *Fr.* 3 (40.17–20).

in the Neopythagorean texts connect a wife's *sōphrosynē* to her modest bodily adornment and demeanor, devotion to childrearing, and proficient household supervision, but still the foundation of female *sōphrosynē* is a woman's marital fidelity. The priority of the marriage relationship is often expressed syntactically when the husband appears first in the series of these household roles. Such an ordering principle is also present in the Pastorals in two places: "Therefore, I want younger [widows] to *marry*, to bear children, to rule a household," and "the young women to be *loving of husbands*, loving of children, ... house-workers" The marital relationship of the older widow likewise comes first (after the age requirement) on the list of qualifications in 1 Tim 5:9–10, there framed as ἐνὸς ἀνδρός γυνή, followed, in the "natural" course of things, by ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν.

The concept of female *sōphrosynē* is joined to a woman's sexual self-control, shown principally in remaining faithful to her husband. This correlation—one might almost say "equivalency"—has so permeated the texts and inscriptions of the time that the same meaning must be conveyed by the Pastorals' epitome of "the good woman." Thus, any woman (or man) in the intended audience of the Pastorals would recognize that enacting the virtue of *sōphrosynē* would entail the wife's marital fidelity. Consequently, while this author holds up the ideal of faithfulness in marriage as the highest standard for *both* men *and* women, he still seems to believe that it is especially important to instruct women to confine their sexual activities to marriage. The author confirms his understanding that marriage and marital fidelity are signs of a "good woman" in three additional rhetorical moves: (1) he contrasts *sōphrosynē* to the behavior of the first ("married") woman, Eve (1 Tim 2:9–15); (2) he sets up a prerequisite that the enrolled older widow be ἐνὸς ἀνδρός γυνή (1 Tim 5:9); and, (3) he connects being *sōphrōn* with the demand that the younger women be φιλάνδρους in Titus 2:4.

1. 1 Timothy 2:9–15: *The Seduction of Eve*

The author's brief exegesis of the narrative accounts of Genesis 2–3 expresses the belief that there is a "natural" female tendency toward marital infidelity in its presentation of the first couple, and especially, the first woman, Eve. In particular, it is his description of Eve, or as she is called in 1 Tim 2:14, "the woman," that adds a female-sexualized meaning to the term *sōphrosynē*: "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being thoroughly deceived, has been in transgression." Since there is significant evidence that this verse serves as a condemnation of Eve's *sexual* seduction by the serpent, that would mean that Eve was unfaithful to her husband. The Pastorals claim that by exhibiting *sōphrosynē* in marital fidelity, believing women can

reverse Eve's fall into sexual temptation, and attain salvation for themselves, as elaborated in 1 Tim 2:15.

2. 1 Timothy 5:9, 11: The Faithfulness Requirement for Widows

The expectation of a woman's marital fidelity is also found in one criterion for a widow to receive church support: she must have been "wife of one husband" (1 Tim 5:9).⁵⁹ This short phrase illustrates the Pastorals' entirely "ehefreundlichen Kontext," as Wagener phrases it,⁶⁰ and confirms this basic understanding that female *sōphrosynē* is demonstrated by remaining faithful in marriage. The Pastorals' author advocates for the overall goodness of marriage (1 Tim 4:3–5; 5:14; Titus 2:4), and even though he may have drawn upon some of the material in 1 Corinthians 7,⁶¹ he never, as Paul grudgingly does, allows divorce as a possibility (1 Cor 7:10–11),⁶² and he certainly never advocates, as Paul did, remaining single as a better option.⁶³ On the contrary, this author accuses his opponents of "forbidding marrying" (1 Tim 4:3a), which view he asserts runs counter to his own creation-theology: "because every creation of God is good" (1 Tim 4:4). Even the confusing statement

⁵⁹ Regarding the enrolled widow of 1 Tim 5:9, Wagener points out: "Die römische *univira* ist keine Witwe" (*Die Ordnung*, 174). In fact, in funerary inscriptions, "lobt häufig der überlebende Ehemann seine gestorbene Frau dafür, daß sie ihm ihr Leben lang treu war" and the earlier moral ideal of *univira* was contrasted with both adulterous and divorced women (ibid., 175). It seems that this is the aim of the Pastorals' teaching as well. Wagener's insightful analysis of this phrase reviews the inconsistencies in many previous interpretations, and asserts that all four occurrences of the expression (for bishop, deacon, presbyter, and enrolled widow) must refer not to any ascetic lifestyle on the part of these persons. Rather the socio-historical background "ist ein Ethik der Hochschätzung ehelicher Verbindung und Treue, wie sie in populärphilosophischen Abhandlungen zur Sexualethik so wie im inschriftlichen Lob der *univira* für Frauen faßbar wird" (ibid., 176). The article that contributes to Wagener's analysis is that of Majorie Lightman and William Zweisel ("Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society," *Church History* 46:1 [1977]: 19–32). Their study begins with archaic Roman traditions and ends with the thoughts of Jerome.

⁶⁰ *Die Ordnung*, 176.

⁶¹ There Paul also addresses the situation of widows in vv. 8–9 and 39–40. This might be another instance of the author's intertextual process as suggested by Merz, but since she does not exegete the "widows passage" in 1 Tim 5:3–16, the idea awaits further examination.

⁶² 1 Cor 7:12–16 is somewhat ambiguous on the matter of divorcing a non-believing spouse, since Paul says that the unbelieving husband or wife might be "sanctified" by the believing spouse (1 Cor 7:14). He repeats the idea by asking whether the believing wife or husband might not indeed save their spouse (1 Cor 7:16). These serve as strong appeals to the believer to remain married, rather than to divorce. Nonetheless, the ambiguity remains, and gives the author of the Pastorals a further reason to compose his letters in order to "correct" Paul and Pauline interpretation.

⁶³ 1 Cor 7:8, 11, 25–27, 32–35.

about some sexually suspect behavior on the part of younger widows—"for when they feel strong desires against Christ, they wish to marry"—is not followed up by a command for them to repent of their (sexual) sin in order to return to a condition of pure singleness, and/or to remain unmarried. Rather, this author says authoritatively in the voice of Paul: "I want the younger [widows] to marry."

While it is noticeable that no such unequivocal instruction to "get married" is given to any of the young men (including "Timothy" and "Titus") constructed as part of the audience of the letters, it is clear that the author assumes that Christian men are held to the same moral standard of faithfulness in marriage:⁶⁴ the ideal of "husband of one wife" (μῑς γυναικός ἄνδρα) is one criterion for bishops (1 Tim 3:2), elders and/or bishops (Titus 1:6), and deacons (1 Tim 3:12). Here the author appears to adapt, for Christian men, the Roman paradigm of "the highly praised state of being *univira*—a woman having only one husband within one's lifetime."⁶⁵ However, it is important to remember that the Pastoral Letters were not the only texts that urged marital fidelity for both husbands and wives. Plutarch writes that "husband and wife must go about this piously, keeping themselves pure [ἀγνεύειν] of any unholy or lawless intercourse with others, or not sowing where they do not wish the crop to grow, and where they are ashamed if the fruit comes, and seek to hide it."⁶⁶ I cite Plutarch as one additional example of Wagener's claim that such a "unified" sexual ethics had "pagane Vorläufer und Parallelen."⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Men also are to father (legitimate) children and have charge of their households.

⁶⁵ Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place*, 21. Their examination of the *univira* ideal suggests: "In a very important sense, the early Christian household codes [by which they mean those in Colossians and Ephesians] hold out an image of the mutually faithful, permanently unified Christian couple, perhaps implicitly encoding the early church teaching against divorce (see Ignatius, *Pol.* 5.1–2)" (*ibid.*, 21–22). Dixon discusses the *univira* as a woman who married only once (and did not divorce) (*The Roman Family*, 32–33). Jane F. Gardner also connects the *univira* to the avoidance of divorce in her essential study, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986; repr. 1995), 22–23, 50–51.

⁶⁶ διὸ δεῖ μάλιστα τούτῳ χρῆσθαι μετ' εὐλαβείας τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, τῶν ἀνιέρων καὶ παρανόμων πρὸς ἐτέρους ἀγνεύοντας ὁμιλιῶν, καὶ μὴ σπείροντας ἐξ ὧν οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς φέεσθαι θέλουσιν ἀλλὰ κἂν γένηται καρπὸς αἰσχύνονται καὶ ἀποκρύπτουσι (*Advice, Mor.* 144B; trans. Donald Russell).

⁶⁷ *Die Ordnung*, 176, n. 54. This conclusion is also voiced by Winter: "There has been a tendency to overlook the fact that in the early Empire, the Christian movement was not the only one that argued for a view of marriage and sexual morality where men and women operated with faithfulness and integrity ..." (*Roman Wives*, 74).

Furthermore, although this phrase “husband of one wife” serves as a “pre-requisite” for church office, it is plainly a moral standard for the broader Christian audience.⁶⁸ And yet, while marital fidelity is the ideal for both sexes, still our author senses he must urge the younger widows (and *not* any younger man) to marry in order to restrain their lustful desires and sexually-suspicious activities.

3. *Titus 2:4–5: Loving One’s Husband*

Another instruction in the Pastorals that speaks to a woman’s role as wife is found in Titus 2:4–5, where the adjective *σώφρονας* is preceded by the command “to be loving of husbands, loving of children” and followed by the other qualities of “pure, good house-workers, subordinated to their own husbands.” As a result, the “husband” stands at both ends of the instructional content, emphasizing syntactically the overarching importance of the marital relationship, as well as the husband’s headship of the wife. From the many literary and inscriptional parallels, Spicq concludes: “φιλάνδρους εἶναι, mettant l’accent, selon les occurrences sur le respect, la tendresse, la fidélité et la vertu.”⁶⁹ That fidelity will be regulated when the wife is in proper subordination to her husband, as commanded in verse 5.⁷⁰ This last clause affirms

⁶⁸ The scholarly consensus on this question is summarized by Wagener: the assumption that the Pastorals posit a “Zwei-Stufen-Ethik” is to be rejected; it is, rather, true that “das allgemeine Eheideal ... für alle Gläubigen gelten soll” (*Die Ordnung*, 173–174).

⁶⁹ *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 392–393. Spicq cites the clearly relevant parallel found in Philo, *Praem.* 139, where he praises wives who are “*sôphrôn* and house-keeping and loving of husband,” *σώφρονας καὶ οἰκουροὺς καὶ φιλάνδρους*. Another linkage of *sôphrosynê* to husband-loving is from Plutarch’s *Ant. vit.* 499C3: “The husband-loving and *sôphrôn* wives of the Indians were quarreling over the fire and fighting with one another,” Ἰνδῶν δὲ φιλάνδροι καὶ σώφρονες γυναῖκες ὑπὲρ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐρίζουσι καὶ μάχονται πρὸς ἀλλήλας. Quinn remarks that “*Philandros* is elsewhere unattested in biblical Greek of the Ap. Frs ...” (*Letter to Titus*, 120). North notes that two parallel terms are found in the epitaph of Claudia Areskousa, “whose qualities begin with *philandria asynkritos* (incomparable love for her husband) and proceed through *philoteknia anyperbletos* (unsurpassable love for her children) and *kallos ameimetos* [sic] (matchless beauty) to reach a climax in *sophrosyne adiegetos* (indescribable virtue)” (“The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee,” 41, citing Richmond Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942], 292).

⁷⁰ Quinn reflects a pre-feminist sentimentality about “subordination” when he states: “The list, which began by noting the bond of affection that is to unite a young wife with her husband, now closes by accenting the bond of obedience” (*Letter to Titus*, 137). He thinks that because the husband is not commanded to place his wife in subordination that the wife’s subordination constitutes a “ready and reverent offering of self and of Christian service to ‘their own husbands’” (*ibid.*, 137–138), or, as he later calls it, “this freely chosen subordination” (*ibid.*, 138).

the belief that a virtuous wife may relate to only one man: her own husband, and not any other.

As with the instructional content concerning women's adornment in 1 Timothy 2, the Pastorals' teachings about women and marriage function as an epitome of this primary element of the *topos* as found in the Pythagorean letters and elsewhere: a wife's sexual faithfulness in marriage is an outward manifestation of her *sōphrosynē*. The author commands that women are to be *φιλάνδροι* and then links that behavior to being *sōphrōn*. But the general societal ideal of married sexual fidelity as a sign of feminine *sōphrosynē* is adapted by the author of the Pastorals for an audience of Christ-believers. First, he asserts certain interpretations of Genesis 2–3 that posit a woman is, from the beginning of time, especially susceptible to sexual temptation. Second, he advocates, against his opposition and perhaps still reflecting his Genesis exegesis, that marriage is a "good creation." And third, he establishes marital faithfulness as a divine requirement for women *and* men, especially for office-holders in the community.

Mother

The close connection of marriage with children, and parents' responsibilities for children is an element of the *topos* which the Pastorals share with many other moral-philosophical writings, as we have seen in to the Pythagorean Letters. The Pastorals convey the understanding that marriage is the appropriate environment for bearing and raising children. Just as the male office-holders are required to fulfill the roles of husbands *and* fathers,⁷¹ so too women are associated with their husbands on the one hand, and their children on the other (1 Tim 5:9–10; 5:14; and Titus 2:4–5).

Theologically speaking, the most significant of the Pastorals' references to women and children is that of 1 Tim 2:15: "But she will be saved through child-bearing, if they remain in faith and in love and in holiness with *sōphrosynē*." Merz's exegesis of this verse offers convincing evidence that v. 15a provides a "*soteriologischer Sonderweg*," which means that "notwendige (allerdings—vgl. v. 15b—nicht hinreichende) Bedingung der eschatologischen Rettung der Frau ist die *τεκνογονία*."⁷² It is clear that the author views childbearing

⁷¹ Again, this is true for the bishops in 1 Tim 3:2–5, the bishop/elders of Titus 1:6, and the deacons in 3:12, but not Timothy and Titus themselves (nor "Paul," of course).

⁷² *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung*, 296; her italics. In Chapter Seven, I have described her exegesis on the three instances in the Pastorals where "salvation" is promised based upon "good works."

and childrearing (within the context of a faithful marriage) as moral requirements for Christian women.⁷³

In addition, as explained in Chapter Five, the Pastorals valorize “mothers” in 2 Tim 1:5, where Timothy’s grandmother and mother are commended, thereby enshrining these two women as examples for later mothers to imitate. Then, by placing Timothy in authority over the whole *ekklēsia* in 1 Tim 5:1–2, the author figuratively makes him the male head of the household of God, ruling over even “the older women as mothers.” In fact, nearly every time women as a group are discussed or instructed in the Pastorals, they are placed in the socially appropriate feminine role of mother (1 Tim 2:15; 5:2, 4, 10, 14; 2 Tim 1:5; Titus 2:3–5).⁷⁴

The author’s strategy reinforces the command for women to marry and gives them a “job” to accomplish, an activity to occupy themselves, primarily with their families and within the physical confines of their homes. Hence, they are also restrained from “going around from house to house ... and saying things that should not be said” (1 Tim 5:13). As a result, when these good Christian women are engaged in passing on the faith to their children, as Lois and Eunice did, they literally become “mothers of the church.”

Despoina

In the Pastorals, women’s management of a household is raised only very briefly. The author includes it in his threefold requirement for the younger widows: “Therefore, I want the younger “widows” to marry, to bear children,

⁷³ The theological difficulty was recognized much earlier than modern scholarship. For example, John Chrysostom questions the meaning of the phrase σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας in *Homily on 1 Timothy* 9.1. Mitchell observes that John struggles with the practical implications of this teaching, as have others after him, asking, “Then what about the virgins? And what about the barren? What about the widows whose husbands died before they bore children? Are they lost? Do they have no hope? ... What in the world, then, does he mean to say here?” τί οὖν πρὸς τὰς παρθένους; τί δὲ πρὸς τὰς στεῖρας; τί δὲ πρὸς τὰς χήρας, τὰς πρὶν ἢ τεκεῖν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀποβαλοῦσας; ἀπολώλασιν; ἐλπίδα οὐκ ἔχουσι; ... Τί ποτε οὖν βούλεται εἰπεῖν; (“Corrective Composition,” 61). Chrysostom solves his dilemma by “deftly [eliding] the Pastor’s term τεκνογονία with παιδοτροφία, which includes both fathers and mothers, and exhorts *both* parents to raise their children properly Apparently tying women’s salvation exclusively to τεκνογονία was too much even for this ardent Pauline admirer to repeat without some considered correction” (ibid.). See also Wagener’s brief comments on earlier interpretations (*Die Ordnung*, 107).

⁷⁴ This is not true of the women mentioned in 1 Tim 3:11 (either wives of deacons or deaconesses), nor of the γυναῖκαρια of 2 Tim 3:6. However, I think that in the Pastorals’ “parent friendly context” (to adapt Wagener’s term “ehefreundlichen Kontext” [*Die Ordnung*, 176]), that Eve would also be remembered as a mother, and Prisca and Claudia would likewise be assumed to be mothers.

to rule a household [οικοδεσποτεῖν].” While the verb *οικοδεσποτέω* is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament, the noun *οικοδεσπότης* is well used in the Gospels for a (male) master of the house. Of course, as Verner states, the Pastorals’ author is not putting women in that male role, but rather alluding to the role of *οικοδεσποίνα*, the “wife of the master the traditional matron of a well-to-do household.”⁷⁵ Two related terms appears in *Theano to Kallisto*: *δεσπότης* (line 11), which seems to refer to both male and female slave owners, as it does in the Pastorals (1Tim 6:1–2; 2Tim 2:21; Titus 2:9), and *δεσποίνης* (line 37) which is clearly a feminine person.⁷⁶

Unlike *Theano to Kallisto*, the Pastorals do not specifically advise the *despoina* on how to manage her slaves.⁷⁷ However, that the Christian woman might take up such responsibility can be inferred from two factors: (1) slaves, both male and female, are envisioned as members of the *ekklēsia* (1Tim 6:1–2; Titus 2:9–10); and (2) wealthy householders are likewise addressed by the author (1Tim 6:17–19; cf. 1Tim 2:9; 3:4–5, 12; 5:6, 16; 2Tim 1:16; 4:19a). Given the significant role of slavery in the Roman economy⁷⁸ along with the social traditions of the time, it was the woman who managed the work of the household, including slave supervision.⁷⁹

Another reference to women’s work in the household is found in the adjective *οικουργός*, which appears in the instructional content for younger women in Titus 2:4–5. This compound word is more ambiguous because it does not connote “rulership” over the household by a *despoina*. In fact, Quinn has translated this word “tending the hearth,” I suppose to convey the idea of “work” (ἐργον).⁸⁰ Perhaps not every woman in the author’s

⁷⁵ *Household of God*, 136.

⁷⁶ *Theano to Kallisto* also refers to the mistress as *kyria* (line 26).

⁷⁷ “Slaves” in *Theano to Kallisto* are identified as: *οικέτης* (line 3) but thereafter as the feminine *θεράπεινα* (lines 8, 15, 22, 33, 42). The Pastorals refer to a slave as *δοῦλος* (1Tim 6:1; Titus 2:9; cf. also 2Tim 2:24; Titus 1:1). But there is also the *διάκονος* (1Tim 3:8, 10, 12–13).

⁷⁸ “Most households, however modest, were partially based on slave labor” (Osiek and M.Y. MacDonald, *A Woman’s Place*, 249). M.I. Finley states his “impression” based on various literary sources, that “... the slave-owning section of the population in antiquity was proportionately greater than the estimated twenty-five per cent in the southern states [of the U.S.]” (*The Ancient Economy*, updated., with foreword by Ian Morris [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999; orig. publ. 1973], 79).

⁷⁹ E.g., Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.21–25, 29–43.

⁸⁰ *Letter to Titus*, 137. Quinn points out there that the cognate verb of this word also occurs in 1 Clement 1.3 (ibid.), which reads: “You [the Corinthian believers] commanded the women to perform all things in a blameless and dignified and holy conscience, feeling proper affection for their own husbands; you taught [them] to remain in the rule of subordination, to work at their household responsibilities with dignity, being altogether *sōphrōn*,” *γυναῖξιν τε ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ σεμνῇ καὶ ἀγνῇ συνειδήσει πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν παρηγγέλλετε, στεργούσας καθηκόντως*

construction of the assemblies was wealthy enough to be an οἰκοδέσποινα, and so he used this unusual word to stress the important of housework for every woman.⁸¹ Or, the assumption behind his teaching might be that even the οἰκοδέσποινα needed to be involved in the hands-on work that makes a household run smoothly.⁸² Either way, the point here is that the author of the Pastorals raises this third domestic role for women, and knows of it as a female corollary to the role of the male head of the household.

The author's understanding of proper household management by a believing woman may be found in the list of qualifications for enrolling older widows (1 Tim 5:9–10). First, she ought to have married one man at some point. Next her “good works” witness to her virtue which is demonstrated by raising children, showing hospitality, washing the saints’ feet, helping the afflicted, being devoted to every good work. Certainly in the ideal household of the Pastorals women had charge of children and performed certain hosting functions (including foot-washing and caring for the sick?). Twice these roles are described as “good works,” echoing the adornment motif of 1 Tim 2:9–10, which in turn connects a woman's domestic functions to her *sōphrosynē*.

By advocating such housework to Christian women, the author provides them with a virtuous occupation that narrows their opportunity for leaving the home and becoming involved in suspect activities. But if they do need to leave the house on some domestic errand, as in *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman*,⁸³ no doubt the author would want them to accomplish this during

τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐαυτῶν· ἐν τε τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε, πάννυ σωφρονούσας. Note the several other parallels to terminology in the Pastorals, and how this passage also draws upon the *topos* of the good woman, using the elements of *sōphrosynē*, wifely duties, and housework, but not adornment or childrearing.

⁸¹ Although the author does address some teachings to slaves, young people, and destitute widows, the various instructions about possessions, slaves, luxurious living, etc., suggest that there were in actuality some persons of wealth and status whom he thought needed that teaching. Kidd states simply, “The Pastorals do appear to presuppose the presence, in fact, the significant presence of rich people” (*Wealth and Beneficence*, 87). Alternatively, if the “real” community was mostly of lower economic and social status, then they might be relieved to hear the wealthy get their come-uppance, as when the author tells them that the love of money is the root of all evil (1 Tim 6:10).

⁸² This leveling of the differences between *despoina* and female slaves was especially recommended to “philosophizing women” by Musonius Rufus: “what works some would think to be servile, [she ought] to do these things without hesitation,” ἃ δὲ δορυλικὰ νομίζουσιν ἔνιοι, ταῦτα ἀόκνως ποιεῖν, *Fr.* 3 (42.8–9).

⁸³ This text instructs: “Therefore not at early dawn nor at evening, but [she must] make the expedition when she is in plain sight after the marketplace is teeming, for the sake of some spectacle or to make some household purchase, led in a nicely ordered way by

the daylight hours, when many people are also out and about, and without ostentatious fanfare. This is how a woman can demonstrate her *sōphrosynē* through her household management of children, slaves, and hospitality, and thus prove once again that her marital fidelity is thoroughly above reproach.

CONCLUSION:

THE CONTENT OF MORAL TRAINING FOR CHRISTIAN WOMEN

In this chapter, I have moved beyond earlier investigations of women's virtue in the Pastorals in order to describe in more detail how the author epitomizes the Greco-Roman *topos* of "the good woman." These contents are then positioned as the subject matter in the author's curriculum for the moral education of Christian women. The evidence presented shows how he has adopted, and adapted various elements of the *topos* in order to extend and explain Pauline teachings about women to his communities. Building on the foundational virtue of *sōphrosynē*, he erects a structure of feminine morality that depends fundamentally upon a woman's sexual faithfulness to her husband, a condition that is then exhibited in her modest adornment and her proper fulfillment of the three traditional household roles of wife, mother, and *despoina*. Each of these female embodiments of *sōphrosynē* relies on a woman's self-control, in particular, control of her sexual expression. In the thinking of the Pastorals, such control comes from her own self, but is "helpfully" reinforced by her subordination to a husband, as well as to other men. Other external constraints influence a woman's behavior by appealing to a cultural sense of shame, and the warning that shameful acts will harm her reputation and that of her community. In point of fact, her very eschatological salvation hinges on her ability to continue in the moral state of *sōphrosynē*.

The Pastorals' special attention to community structure serves to underpin the approved feminine virtues and activities by replicating "normal" household relationships within the "household of God." Accordingly, in the author's compositions, women are almost always identified within the web of domestic relationships: as "wives" (1 Tim 2:13–14; 2 Tim 4:19 [Prisca]; Titus 2:4–5); as "widows" (1 Tim 5:3–16); as "mothers" (1 Tim 2:15; 5:2; 5:4, 7, 10,

the hand by one or at the most two female slaves," ἔπειτα μήτε ὄρφνας ἀνισταμένας μήτε ἐσπέρας ἀλλὰ πλαθυούσας ἀγορὰς καταφανέα γινομέναν τὰν ἐξοδὸν ποιεῖσθαι θεωρίας ἕνεκά τινος ἢ ἀγορασμῷ οἰκῇ μετὰ θεραπαίνας μίᾳς ἢ κατὰ πλείστον δύο εὐκόσμως χειραγωγουμένην (Stob., *Anth.* 4.23.61a [W.-H. 592.17–593.4]).

14; 2 Tim 1:5; Titus 2:4); “grandmothers” (1 Tim 4:7; 5:4, 7; 2 Tim 1:5); as “sisters” (1 Tim 5:2); and as *despoinai* (1 Tim 5:14; Titus 2:5).⁸⁴ That the section about women’s virtuous adornment (1 Tim 2:9–3:1a) leads up to Adam and Eve, the “first couple,” as well as to the activity of “childbearing,” shows that the author tends to think of these “women” (γυναῖκες, 1 Tim 2:9–10; γυνή, 1 Tim 2:11–12) in their conventional household roles, and not as single and/or ascetic women. The only woman not obviously positioned within a household is “Claudia” whose name appears as one of the persons sending greetings to Timothy, but even she might be the wife of one “Linus,” who is mentioned just ahead of her. With just that one exception, the author positions Christian women within the traditional household roles in which they are subordinate to their husbands as wife, mother, and *despoina*.

Since the Pastorals weave together language and concepts for the household and the house church, these three feminine roles are similarly woven into the life of the assembly. As a realistic consequence, the author presumes that the moral endeavors of these women will be enacted in yet a fourth dimension, that of the house church. By way of this remarkable feature, the teachings found in the Pastorals diverge from those of the Pythagorean letters which suppose that feminine morality ought to be performed principally within one’s own household. In the latter corpus a virtuous woman will be conscious of the honorable place of her own family within the more substantial social context of extended family, neighborhood or city, but these situations are for the most part tangential concerns to the authors of the letters. Rooted in the Pauline tradition which characterizes believers as members of a family, the author of the Pastorals seeks to teach and to regulate the female constituents of this larger household.

What might it look like for each believing woman to act out her domestic social status in the multifaceted community of the faithful? I offer a few thoughts in answer:

- (1) A woman’s modest deportment ought not to be abandoned when meeting with her house church; those cultural standards for speech and adornment hold for both home and assembly.⁸⁵ Furthermore, the expectation for female quietness explains in part why women may not teach or have authority over men in the community.

⁸⁴ Here I would perhaps add 2 Tim 3:6–7, since those women are also “at home.”

⁸⁵ Proper feminine conduct continues to come to the fore as later Christian authors are confronted by outsiders who critique the behavior of believing women, e.g., Celsus’ depiction of women out of control, as cited by Origen in *Contra Celsum*, 2.55, 59; 3.55. This text is analyzed by M.Y. MacDonald, *Early Christianity*, 1–5, 104–109.

- (2) Since the teaching done by the older women in Titus 2:3–5 is indeed directed toward younger women in the community, and not just toward their own daughters, this endeavor replicates in some way the mother-daughter relationship among women in the house church.
- (3) Similarly, the “real” widows in the house churches are adopted by those communities as if they were their own mothers deserving of honor (and financial support). As older widows, these women simultaneously demonstrate a lifetime of virtuous works for younger women to imitate, so that if they find themselves in a similar widowed status, they would be eligible to be enrolled on the widows’ welfare list.
- (4) The younger women/younger widows receive much direction from “Paul” and other male elders in the house church, in the same way in which the women were subordinated to the men of their own household. In effect, this teaching allows for paternal supervision of any younger women in need of such governance.
- (5) It may be justifiably presumed that women who were mistresses of a household would continue to manage the slaves, the work, and the provisions of the homes in which an assembly met. Within their own homes, they would discharge the gender-specific duties of the hostess as member of both household and house church. It is also conceivable that a woman married to a male head of a house church, or an overseer of several house churches was perceived as obtaining a residual authority over the activities of those assemblies. Functioning as a sort of “first lady,” she might have advised on logistics for meetings, the furnishings, meal-planning, seating arrangements, and perhaps childcare. Might she also have assumed power over others of lesser status? For example, might she have assigned tasks to the slaves of another believer, or slaves who participated without their owners?
- (6) An all-purpose illustration for how house church members ought to relate is found in the instruction for the interactions between Timothy and all others in the assembly: to treat them “as fathers ... as brother ... as mothers ... as sisters ...” (1 Tim 5:1–2). In brief, treat everyone as family, and you will thus fulfill the Pauline expectations for how to conduct yourself in the household of God (1 Tim 2:15).

The complicated textual and historical interconnections between household and house church show that, although the Pastorals have adopted the three approved domestic roles for women, from his perspective the faithful woman has yet a fourth arena in which to develop her virtue. Furthermore, according to the author, a woman’s conduct within the household of God

bears profound theological meaning: her moral behavior effectively leads to her actual salvation (1 Tim 2:15). Of course, in the Pythagorean corpus, there exists no composite social arena, and certainly no such corresponding far-reaching result of feminine virtue.

The Pastorals' treatment of wealth and poverty probably also relates to the issues of women and leadership roles in the community. If wealthy believers (men and/or women) were assuming that they would take leadership roles in the assembly, the author contradicts their presumption by downplaying the acquisition of earthly possessions as a means to the attaining of eternal life. Yet he still envisions that male heads of households will assume similar positions within the churches. Women of some wealth are specifically addressed: a stereotypical feminine preference for extravagant clothing is criticized, so that "good works" are established as the true Christian adornment for women (1 Tim 2:9–10), and a widow who is living luxuriously is likewise harshly judged (1 Tim 5:6). Any "believing woman" who has widows is instructed to provide for them (1 Tim 5:16). On the other hand, impoverished widows, who are "real" widows, are to be honored, especially if they have accomplished "good works" (1 Tim 5:9–10). These are summed up in a combination of requirements: marital faithfulness, childrearing, and hospitality (reminiscent of the *topos*) as well as achieving the age of sixty years, washing the feet of the saints and assisting the afflicted. No matter what social and legal position a wealthy female believer might aspire to in her city or province, within the assemblies such are the prescriptions by which a woman's morality is evaluated.⁸⁶

When countering a "heterodox opposition" which appears to be urging some form of asceticism, the author of the Pastorals supplies what he calls the "good deposit" of true Christian teachings. For the women in his audience, this means that he interweaves an abbreviated form of the moral-philosophical *topos* of "the good woman" with Christian terminology and theological reasoning. In epitomizing and adapting that *topos* for a Christian audience, he ties women's proper adornment to Christian "good works" (1 Tim 2:10; cf. also 5:10 [twice]; possibly Titus 2:5); invokes Pauline authority directly (1 Tim 2:12; 5:14); supplies brief interpretations of the two

⁸⁶ Scholarship on women's benefactions, especially in Asia Minor, supports the perception that rich and noble women could attain a certain amount of independence, social power, and recognition, as shown by van Bremen, "Women and Wealth," 223–242; and Mary Taliaferro Boatwright, "Plancia Magna of Perge: Women's Roles and Status in Roman Asia Minor," in *Women's History and Ancient History* (ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 249–272.

Genesis creation accounts (1 Tim 2:13–14; 4:4); makes a soteriological statement (1 Tim 2:15a, followed by the slogan πιστός ὁ λόγος); uses a Pauline (or Christian-traditional) triad (1 Tim 2:15b); brings in the Jewish/Christian tradition about faithful widows (1 Tim 5:5); and warns that women who act improperly have received God's judgment (1 Tim 5:12). He praises Lois and Eunice for fulfilling the role of good Christian mother (2 Tim 1:5), and his accusation of the "frivolous women" of 2 Tim 3:6–7 is phrased theologically: "filled with sins, ... always learning and never able to come to a knowledge of truth." If the opponents have had "significant success among the womenfolk,"⁸⁷ then the author's response is to buttress the *topos* of "the good woman" with appeals to Christian scriptures, theology, and practice, all wrapped up in the authority of the apostle Paul. His epistolary compositions became crucial for the development of orthodox Christian teaching about women's virtue, adornment, and their roles in the household and house church.

Throughout the letters, the author offers such "Christianizing" of moral-philosophical ideals for women, in order to achieve two stated and interlocking purposes, one focused on the behaviors of those *inside* his group, and one focused on the opinions of those *outside* his group. First, he intends for the *internal* audience, the actual readers or hearers of the Pastorals' instructions for women, to learn (or be reminded) that Christian faith and practice are not at all antithetical to the moral values of their culture. This is nicely shown when he places the learning and demonstration of the stereotypical virtues (for men as well as women) under "the grace of God," whose work is said to be that of παιδεύειν (Titus 2:11–12). Thus, in the author's view, for a Christian woman to live a pious life she must embody feminine *sōphrōn* behavior in sexual self-control, which extends to her adornment, marriage, mothering, and household management. In short, she must incarnate the *topos* of "the good woman" already "revealed" in texts like the Pythagorean letters, but now incorporated as part of an authentic Pauline παραθήκη.

The second purpose is rooted in how the author perceived virtuous behavior as a sign to outsiders. His prescription for women to behave virtuously is twice supported by appeals to the reputation of the faith and/or the community (1 Tim 5:14; Titus 2:4–5). When women enacted their *sōphrosynē* in their households, neighborhoods, and cities, these demonstrations themselves would serve as a testimony to outsiders, gaining a good reputation for the Christian community as a whole. Because it was commonly assumed

⁸⁷ Karris, "The Background and Significance of the Polemic," 563.

by many segments of society, including male and female Christian believers, that *sōphrosynē* was paramount among women's moral virtue, it could function as a baseline measurement of the virtuous character of both an individual woman and the community to which she belonged. Therefore, the Pastorals' author recognizes the importance of women's behavior in and around his communities, and seeks to bring it (or, *keep it*) in line with social expectations, so that society would attribute a positive reputation to the community as well.

That the Pastorals plainly present an epitome of the *topos* of "the good woman" provides more evidence that this model of feminine virtue was known to persons of different social rankings, and had extended across the empire. Therefore, it was not necessary for the author to cover all the mapped territory of the *topos*; he had only to name a few landmarks along the way in order to evoke the sights of "the good woman" in all her virtuous glory and to remind his readers of their moral destination. Along the way, he creates a specifically Christian view of the *topos*, a perspective that accepts the basic outline of women's *sōphrosynē* while adding theological substance and warrants in order to show how beneficial that particular moral ideal is for believing women, their households, and their religious communities.

This conception of "the good *Christian* woman" operates as the instructional content proposed by the author for the moral training of women in his communities. Its various elements comprise the subject matter which the older women are expected to teach and to model for the younger women. Of course, the contents are also "overheard" by and are well-known to the male members of his audience, among them husbands, fathers, and masters of women, including the appointed male leaders who are responsible for passing on the entire faith tradition. The author of the Pastorals wants to compel everyone in the assemblies to comply with his understanding of the *topos* of "the good woman," an aspiration that found its fulfillment within Christian orthodoxy for centuries to come.

CONCLUSION

My investigation has shown that, in the first place, the Pastorals sketch a program of moral training for women, an epistolary *curriculum*, that has much in common with the educational process represented in and furthered by the Pythagorean women's letters. Most notably, a similar gender perspective permeates the curriculum: both corpora suppose (1) that women as well as men can be taught by means of instructional letters that employ pedagogical techniques of paraenesis, rebuke, and antithetical argumentation; yet (2) unlike the training of men, the moral education of women requires female teachers, especially to serve as examples of feminine virtue, as well as a subject matter tailored to the perceived needs of women.

In the second place, despite the similarities between the two corpora, the Pastoral and Pythagorean letters differ significantly on several counts, the most prominent arising from the distinctive educational and historical contexts of the letters. While the Pythagorean women's letters emerge from the intellectual milieu of popular moral philosophy, the author of the Pastorals constructs a curriculum for Christian women that makes use of two strands of ancient thought: the popular philosophical, and the Pauline traditions. Specifically, the Pastorals rely upon on the extensive heritage of Paul, the apostolic teacher, writer of letters to Christian churches, and the subject of history and legend. My analysis identifies three key differences: (1) Christian theological content is used to provide substantial justification for the argumentation in the Pastorals; (2) their author had at hand copies of letters in the distinctively Pauline epistolary form, while the Pythagorean authors appear to have had no written records from Melissa, Myia, or Theano on which to base their compositions; and (3) following the example of Paul's letters, the Pastorals give much teaching for communities divided into social groups, i.e., men, women, elders, children, slaves, and not only to women (and occasionally, children), as is the case with the Pythagorean women's letters. Although the differences between the Christian and Pythagorean corpora may appear quite obvious, they are nonetheless important for interpreting the Pastorals' distinctive curriculum for women because this program is rooted in Jewish and Christian debates and appears in a Pauline epistolary form, with the expectation that its teachings will be enacted by female believers in early Christian communities.

My comparisons of the Pastoral and Pythagorean letter collections have been organized around four main points which are understood as essential components of any educational program: text resources, teachers and learners, methods, and topics.

TEXTUAL RESOURCES

What tangible materials were developed for women to “study,” and how were these texts packaged and transmitted? In the instances of the Pastoral and Pythagorean texts, we possess instructional *letters*, and these remains are similar in that they survive materially in the form of a corpus, rather than simply as individual letters. Beginning with evidence from the early fourth century CE, both the Pastoral and Pythagorean letters are preserved within collections. Although the text history of the Pastorals is more continuous over the course of time, while that of the Pythagorean letters has a long break from the first extant manuscript (*P. Haun.* II.13) to the Renaissance codices, both corpora emerged in the Roman Imperial Age when epistolary collections were popular. The Pythagorean women’s letters show some historical separation between two smaller groups: the three letters of Theano and the two letters *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis* occur in differing sequence, and sometimes the Theano group appears by itself. The Pastorals show some irregularities in their transmission as well, but are most often found in the canonical cluster now called “letters to individuals” that is affixed to the Pauline “letters to churches.”

One obvious way that the composition of these texts differs is in the choice of pseudonyms: the Pastorals come down to us under the name of one man who was already celebrated as an letter-writer, while the several Pythagorean women are not otherwise known in this capacity. The author of the Pastorals possessed much information about Paul and even actual Pauline letters, and therefore copied and adjusted the literary form established by the apostolic teacher. That his project flourished as a part of a larger Pauline corpus demonstrates the skill of his epistolary imitation. Since there were no other letters from any Melissa, Myia, or Theano, their authors took the opportunity to fill in the historical gap by writing letters that would have plausibly come from the hands of these women. While an effort was made to align the letters *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis* with other Neopythagorean texts by using a Doricized vocabulary, it was not necessary for the authors of the five letters to reproduce a specific philosophical outlook or epistolary form in order to authenticate the contents of their texts. All they

needed was to begin with the famous pseudonym of a virtuous woman and then keep the contents in line with the *topos* of “the good woman” which she was thought to represent.

All these letters are meant to be read and interpreted within their collections. One of the main reasons for reading them as a group lies in the commonality of their contents. The Pythagorean letters all address moral training for women. The Pastoral letters similarly seek the moral training of their audience, both male and female, and share other concerns with the rest of the *Corpus Paulinum*: communicating Pauline theology and guidance to groups of believers. Within each corpus, the letters are also bound together by linguistic and syntactic connections,¹ as well as by the fame of the pseudonymous author. As collections, the individual letters maintain with each other a consistency of perspective and teaching, a fact that can be easily corroborated by re-reading and cross-referencing among the letters. Additionally, as components of an interrelated collection, the letters build up a body of work that is literally weightier than any one letter, which amplifies the authority behind their message as well as increasing their chances of preservation.

Despite the differences in the history of these letters, both share the principal objective of providing written instruction, and they function as textual resources for the ancient curriculum of training in virtue. Even though the two corpora display a gender-differentiated worldview, there is no such distinction to be found in the rationale for producing the letters: the authors have adopted the form of letters in collections—a practice common for teaching moral philosophy to men—in order to target female students in their audiences. This suggests that the authors anticipated that the letter collections would be used in a comparable fashion: being read and re-read aloud with the audience making cross-references and discussing the contents. This process of study would probably happen within a communal setting (family, household, or house-church), which means that although the letters have much to say directly to women, male members of each group would also attend to the teachings specific to women. The texts thus function as tools for socialization, for transmitting the approved customs of that culture to everyone. In the case of the Pastorals, the letters prescribe how such social conventions are to be adapted for the Christian sub-culture known as “the household of God.”

¹ E.g., the pseudo-Doric prose of *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*, and the vocabulary shared by the Pastorals apart from the other Paulines.

TEACHERS AND LEARNERS

Every educational program calls for teachers—those who establish the course of study and communicate its contents—and learners—those who follow the direction of the teachers and seek to understand and to inculcate the curriculum. Who are the teaching and learning participants in this process of moral training? What is their relationship and how are they characterized? The curriculum represented in the Pastoral and Pythagorean letters constructs a distinctive relationship between older female teachers and younger female learners. The teachers not only verbalize the subject matter to be learned, but they need to embody it in every area of their lives, so that the best teachers are older and wiser women who have successfully and tangibly proved their own virtue. Since the Pythagoreans Melissa, Myia, and Theano were known for their moral accomplishments, their names increase the authority of the teachings contained in their letters, and then their good reputations offer them as examples to emulate. There is good reason to suppose that these letters might have been written by men using female pseudonyms, not only because of the excellence of the named women, but also because it would appear less seemly in general for men to instruct women, especially on the topic of feminine virtue. The Pastorals likewise present older women as the best teachers and examples of virtuous behavior for younger women, and the qualifications for these teachers are consistent with the portrayals of the famed Pythagorean women. However, the Christian letters also preserve official roles in the *ekklēsia* for male teachers of women, which implies that some education occurs in settings where both sexes are present, with some options for sex-segregated teaching.

In both corpora younger women are placed in the subordinate role of learners, a status that effectively silences them and then restricts their activities to the domestic arena. Two of the Pythagorean letters, *Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate*, censure the fictional recipient, and this demonstrates the inferior status of the younger female in relation to the older teacher. A similar hierarchical relationship is revealed in *Theano to Kallisto* which lightheartedly refers to the paraenesis continually proceeding from older to younger women. Age differences between sender and recipient are also suggested in *Melissa to Kleareta* and *Myia to Phyllis*. Within the Pastorals, learners of both sexes are generally depicted as younger persons, but the author expresses anxieties about the learning process of young women in particular (1 Tim 5:13; 2 Tim 3:6–7). Therefore, he categorically places them in subjection to all teachers (1 Tim 2:11–12).

Certainly, the Pythagorean authors would similarly envision younger women as subordinate to male teachers, but this is not explicitly articulated in their letters, nor is the idea of a general subordination to all (or all men?) used in that corpus. The closest parallel concept is found in *Melissa to Kleareta*, which contends that “she should please her own husband by completing his desires, for the wishes of her husband ought to be an unwritten law for the decorous woman, according to which she must live.” In fact, the letter *Theano to Nikostrate* places less emphasis on this hierarchy of husband over wife, and much more the *κοινωνία* of the marriage relationship with its mutual benefits to both spouses (lines 7–11, 16–20). Given this textual evidence, and in contrast to the stated concerns about young women found in the Pastorals, the Pythagorean letters seem more optimistic about the moral “teachability” of the female sex.

TEACHING METHODS

What pedagogical methods are brought to bear on the process of training women? By what means would they be educated, and how do these letters express those methods? Like the authors of the Pythagorean letters, the author of the Pastorals adopts rhetorical styles and features that situate his compositions within a philosophical educational context. That the means of persuasion utilized for women are the same as those for men demonstrates the authors’ implicit belief that women may be *appealed to*, *instructed*, *advised*, and *exhorted* in a fashion similar to that for men. The authors see no gender-based difference in the application of teaching strategies, as can be plainly seen in the Pastorals, which are written for an audience that includes both men and women. There the teachings for women are intermixed with those for men, for older and younger persons, for assembly-leaders, for slaves, for the wealthy. By addressing a variety of social groups, the author expresses his overall goal of providing Christian moral training for entire communities, not just individuals, and, under the name of Paul, “herald, apostle and teacher” (1Tim 2:7; 2Tim 1:11), he applies the same general instructional methods to everyone.

The two primary means by which teaching is accomplished through both corpora are paraenesis and censure. From the characterizations found in epistolary handbooks, the Pythagorean texts may be straightforwardly identified as either paraenetic (*Melissa to Kleareta*, *Myia to Phyllis*, and *Theano to Kallisto*) or censorious letters (*Theano to Euboule* and *Theano to Nikostrate*). The first type presents itself as offering reminders of socially

acceptable ideas already known by the recipient, while the second type points out the wrong choices and behavior of the recipient with the goal of reforming her actions. The Pastorals take the basic form of paraenetic letters addressed to friendly recipients, but they also contain instructions for the rebuking of opponents and others whose teachings and activities are morally improper.² Furthermore, in Titus 2:4 the older women are given the responsibility of instructing the young women in *sōphrosynē* (σωφροσύνη), using a stronger word than παραινέιν. Rather than simply offering advice, these female teachers are told to exert a greater measure of control over their students, similar to the modes of censure and rebuke. On the other hand, no woman is ever allowed to teach or “to have authority over” (αὐθεντεῖν) any male member of the community (1 Tim 2:12).

Throughout these letters, much of the instruction, whether in gentle nudges or sharp indictments, comes in the manner of three antithetical pairings: virtues and vices, promises of reward and warnings of punishment, and moral and immoral examples. As is typical of philosophical instruction, the overall pedagogical objective is to encourage the learner to affiliate with the positive side, while avoiding the negative. This is believed to be accomplished by appealing to the reader’s *pathos*: one ought to be attracted to the value of good conduct but ought to have a feeling of repugnance toward and a fear of the consequences of socially unacceptable behaviors. In both corpora, while the content of the antitheses display some gender-differentiation (e.g., the immoral examples of the *hetaira*, Medea, and Eve are all women), the mode of education of women by antithetical argumentation parallels that for men. From this evidence, I conclude that the Christian and Pythagorean authors understood that female as well as male learners would be susceptible to such a process of instruction, so that both sexes are thought capable of making moral progress by means of considering and choosing between antitheses.

TOPICS FOR WOMEN

What kind of information might be covered in such a curriculum for women? What exactly did women need to learn? Taking up “the good woman” *topos*, all of the letters advise that a peculiarly feminine form of

² Different terms are used for censure and rebuke in the various letters. *Theano to Euboule* has ἐπιτιμᾶν (lines 28 and 38), while *Theano to Nikostrate* uses ἐλέγχειν (lines 12 and 15). The Pastorals show a preference for terms in the latter family (1 Tim 5:20; 2 Tim 3:16; Titus 1:9, 13; 2:15). What matters is that both acts involve indicting and correcting wrong behavior.

sōphrosynē ought to be exhibited by a virtuous woman: first by restricting her sexual activities to marriage, and then by manifesting her fidelity in her modest adornment, speech, and demeanor, and by appropriate fulfillment of the domestic roles of wife, mother, and *despoina*.

Each corpus asserts that the practice of female *sōphrosynē* materializes in faithfulness to one husband, and both assume that even women of non-elite social status ought to enact some form of the virtue in marriage (though whether the partners were legally capable of marrying is not addressed by these letters). The wifely role is crucial for any woman to perform since this is where she maintains her subordinate position, as similarly articulated in *Melissa to Kleareta* (lines 19–22; also Titus 2:5; 1 Tim 2:11–12).

All the letter-writers teach that every good woman ought to raise her children well so that they too will develop as *sōphrōn* and orderly adults. The ultimate reward for the faithful mothering of Lois and Eunice is that Timothy grew up to possess a spirit of “power and love and σωφρονισμός” (2 Tim 1:7), and that he proved himself to be the “genuine child” of the apostle Paul (1 Tim 1:2; cf. 2 Tim 2:2). Likewise the mothers Phyllis and Euboule are instructed to focus on proper child-rearing which is described in terms of *sōphrosynē* (*Myia to Phyllis*, line 17; and *Theano to Euboule*, line 4). One important role for mothers is to nurture this virtue in the young by enacting it in their own lives.

Both the Pythagorean and Pastoral letters remind the reader that the morality (or immorality) of the mistress of the household affects the reputation of the entire household. Although the Pythagorean letters maintain a tight focus on instructing women within an individual family system, yet the behavior of the female head of the house rebounds in either benefit or damage for all the members of the household, as when “Theano” warns “Nikostrate”: “But will you have no care for your household and will you destroy your husband?” (line 56; cf. also *Theano to Kallisto*, lines 12–18). In the Pastorals, this household is larger and more important than a single domestic establishment: it has grown into the “household of God.” Therefore, the approved feminine roles are played out within a woman’s own household as well as in her house church. Because the customary system for family relationships has been adapted for the organization and activities of the community of the faithful, all of its participants are described as members of a family. Furthermore, the reputation of God’s household rests upon each member’s proper moral behavior as expected from their gender, age, and other markers of social status.

Because the Pythagorean letters concentrate only on the special circumstance of moral instruction for women their authors cover almost all of the

elements of “the good woman” *topos* in depth. Since the Pastorals attempt to instruct both sexes, and since the author is also seeking to explain previous Pauline teachings, the amount of space paid to women’s education is condensed, so that the author has epitomized various elements of the *topos*.³ His spare evocations of *sōphrosynē*, modest adornment, and household roles are mean to bring to mind the broader social tradition of female virtues, leading the audience across the mental map of the entire *topos*. Since the Pastorals offer an abbreviated form of the *topos*, then, the contents of the Pythagorean women’s letters might be viewed as expanded subject matter which the author of the Pastorals expects his older women to teach to the young women. In this scenario, if the texts ascribed to Pythagorean women had ever appeared in the surroundings of a house-church, they would have been understood as suitable “supplemental readings” in the moral formation of Christian women, so that in such a setting, the female teachers would make use of the same kind of texts, teacher-learner relationships, pedagogical techniques, and topics. Yet they would then add particularly Christian (and Pauline) validations as warrants for their claim: scripture would be appealed (as in 1 Tim 4:3–4); Mother Eve, Lois, Eunice and other women distinctive to the tradition would be invoked as (im)moral examples; Paulinist phrasings would appear (such as the triad “faith, love, and holiness” in 1 Tim 2:15) and his letters referenced (1 Tim 2:11–12 with 1 Cor 14:33b–35); theological promises of salvation (1 Tim 2:15) set up against warnings of error, death, and destruction (1 Tim 5:6, 12, 15; 2 Tim 3:5–7) and the reputation of the *ekklēsia* within the larger social setting (Titus 2:5) would be placed before the young women as buttresses for the contents of the *topos*.

My investigation of the two corpora has described the *topos* of “the good woman” in a much more complex way: it is not simply the case that women *as women* are expected to exhibit certain kinds of *sōphrōn* behavior. Rather the *topos* places *sōphrosynē* at the moral epicenter of a woman’s life, with the closest and most important element of that virtue being her continued sexual fidelity to her husband. Extending out from this core concept are: (1) the instructions for quietness and modest bodily adornment that signal her sexual unavailability; (2) the warnings for circumspect interac-

³ The Pastorals even mention the avoidance of drunkenness, but not just for women (1 Tim 3:3, 8, 11; Titus 1:7; 2:3). The missing elements are: proper religious observances, honoring parents, and the details of managing household property besides slaves. Also, the component of appropriate speech and silence for women is less developed than in Plutarch, *Advice*.

tions in arenas outside her household, which also ensure that she will not engage in extra-marital sex; (3) the belief that a woman's faithfulness will enable her to bear legitimate children; (4) the idea that a woman's responsibility for the management of the household (which overlaps with the task of proper child-rearing) demonstrates her *sōphrosynē* toward her husband-partner, bringing honor to both of them, while preserving the resources of the entire household. The Pastoral and Pythagorean letters seek to remind their audiences of this familiar and acceptable "feminine moral topography," where the boundaries of this "map" are the social and even physical boundaries of a woman's domestic functions. Because the appropriate conduct of the wife, mother, and *despoina* stands at the very core of the family itself, her virtue radiates from within her soul, and then, by means of these accomplishments, out into the world as an indication of greater familial honor. This is one reason why female morality in particular remains such a crucial philosophical discussion for persons of both sexes.

Indeed, the Pastorals explicitly raise a larger context for the usual female (and male) domestic roles, and that is the assembly of believers. The author seeks to instruct his audience in the suitable navigation of these complicated social dynamics in the house church (which have already attested to in Pauline letters). Consequently, in this arena, the faithful woman will replicate the demeanor and activities of virtuous wife (and perhaps widow), mother, and house-mistress, and, in the author's opinion, she needs "Paul's" own teaching on how to accomplish this delicate transference from one to the other.

That is one reason why, even though the author of the Pastorals has adopted many of the instructional, topical, rhetorical, and formal elements found in the Pythagorean women's letters, he also claims other defining literary and doctrinal foundations for his compositions: Jewish scriptures and teachings allied with Pauline/Christian letters and heritage. The influences of these other foundations appear in the author's broad focus on community function, in the theological evidence used to substantiate his arguments, and in the stamp of Paulinism on his entire production, from Pauline pseudonyms and personalia, to issues of church order and opposition disputed by Paul, to the characteristic Pauline epistolary form in a (Pauline) letter-collection. By comparison, the letters attributed to Pythagorean women emerge from a wider and more popular philosophical background than the three Pastorals, so that the Pastorals may be seen as the products of a narrower religious sub-culture, albeit one that shares the moral-philosophical goal and methods of leading persons to virtue, and that relies

upon many of the same social expectations for women. Therefore, because the author naturally inhabits both cultural worlds at the same time, he has incorporated elements of both Pauline and philosophical streams of thought *and* practice into his letters. Indeed, his aim is to move the Christian communities of his time to a more thorough synthesis of the two, which can be seen especially in his outline of a program of moral training for Christian women.

In point of fact, the gender-differentiated curriculum represented by the Pythagorean and Pastoral letters was again taken up and adapted for Christians by the well-educated Clement of Alexandria (*flor.* 180–200 CE). As already seen in Chapter Two, Clement attests to the high virtue of Judith, Esther, Susanna, “the sister of Moses,” and Sarah from Jewish texts and places Theano and Myia, along with many other female philosophers and Greek literary figures in their company (*Strom.* 4.19).⁴ The *sōphrosynē* which these women possessed was demonstrated in their sexual modesty and marital faithfulness. After recounting the deeds of all these women, Clement summarizes the benefits of philosophical training for women:

Therefore, the *sōphrōn* woman ought first to persuade her husband to become a partner with her in what leads to happiness. But if that proves impossible, let her only be zealous for virtue, while obeying her husband in all things so as to do nothing against his will except what is reckoned to be superior in virtue and salvation.⁵

Here Clement carefully links “virtue and salvation” to show that Greek moral philosophy is properly aligned with Christian theology, and that both are beneficial for the *sōphrōn* female believer, especially when she obeys her husband.

Likewise, Clement expresses the point of view that both men and women need to acquire virtue: “*Sōphrosynē* is common to all people who have chosen it, but it is professed by us that each sort possess the same nature and also the same virtue. Therefore, the woman does not have one human

⁴ Almost as if he had read *Theano to Nikostrate*, Clement also cites a “teaching” from Tragedy: “Tragedy says, ‘Beauty helped no woman with her wedded husband, but virtue helped many; for every good woman, who has become one with her husband, knows how to be *sōphrōn*,’” οὐδεμίαν, φησὶν ἡ τραγωδία, ὤνησε κάλλος εἰς πόσιν ξυνάρορον, ἀρετὴ δὲ ὤνησε πολλὰς· πᾶσα γὰρ ἀγαθὴ γυνή, ἥτις ἀνδρὶ συντέτηκε, σωφρονεῖν ἐπίσταται, *Strom.* 4.20.126.

⁵ “Ἐλοιτ’ ἂν οὖν ἡ σώφρων πρῶτον μὲν πείθειν τὸν ἄνδρα κοινωνὸν αὐτῇ γίνεσθαι τῶν πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν φερόντων, εἰ δὲ ἀδυνάτως ἔχοι, μόνῃ σπευδέτω ἐπ’ ἀρετὴν, πάντα μὲν τῷ ἀνδρὶ πειθομένη ὡς μηδὲν ἄκοντος ἐκείνου πράξαι ποτε πλὴν ὅσα εἰς ἀρετὴν τε καὶ σωτηρίαν διαφέρειν νομίζεται, *Strom.* 4.19.123.

nature, and the man another, but the same [human nature], as also with virtue.”⁶ Yet Clement does believe there is a gender difference in how this virtue is put into practice:

Then we do not say that the nature of the female is the same as the male, insofar as it is female; for at any rate it is proper for there to exist some difference between each of them if there were no difference between man and woman, each of them would do and experience the same things but since there is a difference, according to the distinctive property of the body, she is [destined] for pregnancy and housekeeping.⁷

Although Clement follows this complicated statement with a citation from “the apostle” in 1 Cor 11:3a–c and 8, his conclusion also echoes that of *On the Sōphrosynē of a Woman* and Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, both of which point to the differences in male and female bodies as the basis for gendered virtues and responsibilities. The Pythagorean treatise states:

Some [virtues] are more suitable for a man to train in and to possess, and some more for a woman. For courageous deeds and practical wisdom are more [suitable] for a man, both on account of *the state of his body* and on account of the power of his soul, but *sōphrosynē* [is more suitable] for the woman.⁸

Similarly, Xenophon makes the connection explicit: “For he equipped *the man’s body* and soul to be better able to endure cold and heat and travel and battles; thus, he assigned the outdoor tasks to him. But *the body of the woman* being less capable of these things, it seems to me the god naturally assigned to her the indoor tasks.”⁹

⁶ κοινή ... πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν γε ἐλομένων ἢ σωφροσύνη· ὡμολόγηται δ’ ἡμῖν τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν κατὰ γένος ἕκαστον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ ἰσχεῖν ἀρετὴν. οὐκ ἄλλην τοῖνον πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα φύσιν ἔχειν ἢ γυνή, ἄλλην δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ φαίνεται. ἀλλ’ ἢ τὴν αὐτὴν, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν, *Strom.* 4.8.58–59.

⁷ τὸ μὲν τοῖνον τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι φύσιν τοῦ θήλεος πρὸς τὸ ἄρρεν, καθὼ θηλὴ ἐστίν, οὐ φαμέν· πάντως γάρ τινα καὶ διαφορὰν ὑπάρχειν προσήκεν ἑκατέρῳ τούτων, εἰ δὲ μὴδὲν ἦν τὸ διάφορον ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς, τὰ αὐτὰ ἂν ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἔδρα τε καὶ ἔπασχεν ἦ δὲ διάφορον, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ιδιότητα, ἐπὶ τὰς κυήσεις καὶ τὴν οἰκουρίαν, *Strom.* 4.8.59–60.

⁸ Stob., *Anth.* 61a (W.-H. 589, 5–590, 1). The Greek for this section is found in Chapter Three, n. 281. *On the Sōphrosynē* also divides up the functions of daily life between males and females: “But I think that some things are characteristic for a man, and some for a woman, and some are common to man and woman, and some are more for a man than for a woman, and some more for a woman than for a man. On the one hand, characteristic activities for a man are to serve as a general, and to take part in government, and to speak in the assembly. On the other hand, characteristic activities for a woman are to keep the house and to stay indoors and to wait for and to take care of her husband.”

⁹ *Oec.* 7.23. See Introduction, n. 27 for the Greek.

At the close of this dissertation, it is appropriate to observe that Clement chooses Titus 2:3–5 as one text to authenticate his own instructions on “the good woman” *topos*. Clement says that the believing woman is to attempt:

to lead a sinless life ... considering God to be her assistant and partner in this action, who is her real defender and savior both for the present and for the future, having made him the leader and commander of her every action, regarding *sōphrosynē* and *dikaiosyne* as her work,¹⁰ and making the love of God her end. Therefore the apostle gracefully says in the letter to Titus, “older women ought to be in a reverent demeanor, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, so that they might instruct the young women in *sōphrosynē*, to be loving of husbands, loving of children, *sōphrōn*, pure, good house-keepers,¹¹ subordinated to their own husbands, so that the word of God might not be defamed.”¹²

As we have seen, in Clement’s opinion one of the best female examples of this virtuous behavior is the Pythagorean Theano. A few hundred years later, her fame had diminished, but some letters attributed to her and to Myia and Melissa survived to be preserved during the early Renaissance. Then too, through the work of the author of the Pastorals, the *sōphrosynē* of such women remained for centuries the gold standard for Christian women who had never even heard of the illustrious female Pythagoreans. The result was that most branches of Christianity built upon this very legacy of moral education, and also taught their women to become, in essence, good philosophers of the household.

¹⁰ That Clement too understands feminine *sōphrosynē* as sexual faithfulness in marriage is expressed by his later citation from Hebrews 13:4: “Then, as if putting a sort of finishing stroke to the question about marriage, he [Paul] adds: ‘Marriage ought to be honorable among all, and the marriage bed undefiled; but sexually immoral persons and adulterers God will judge’” εἶθ’ οἷον κολοφῶνα ἐπιθείς τῷ περὶ γάμου ζητήματι ἐπιφέρει· “τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσι καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος· πόρνους δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ θεός” (*Strom.* 4.20.129). Clement thinks of Paul as the author of Hebrews.

¹¹ Note that Clement uses οἰκουρούς (rather than οἰκουργούς), which supports the reading adopted by NA27.

¹² ἀναμάρτητον διεξάγειν βίον ... συλλήπτορα καὶ κοινωνόν τῆς τοιαύτης πράξεως τὸν θεὸν εἶναι νομίζουσα, τὸν τῷ ὄντι παραστάτην καὶ σωτήρα εἰς τε τὸ παρὸν εἰς τε τὸ μέλλον, στρατηγόν τε καὶ ἡγεμόνα πάσης πράξεως ἐκέινον πεποιημένη, σωφροσύνην μὲν καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἔργον ἡγουμένη, τὸ θεοφιλὲς δὲ ποιουμένη τέλος. χαριέντως γοῦν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τίτον ἐπιστολῇ ὁ ἀπόστολος δεῖν εἶναι φησι “τάς πρεσβύτιδας ἐν καταστάματι ἱεροπρεπεῖ, μὴ διαβόλους, μὴ οἶνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας, ἵνα σωφρονίζωσι τὰς νέας φιλάνδρους εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους, σώφρονας, ἀγνάς, οἰκουρούς, ἀγαθὰς, ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῇται” *Strom.* 4.20.127–128. It is curious that Clement does not include the appellation καλοδιδασκάλους for the older women in Titus 2:4. None of the extant manuscripts are missing this word. Is this just an oversight on his part, or did he omit it on purpose in order to stress the teaching prohibition for women?

APPENDIX A

GREEK TEXT OF PYTHAGOREAN LETTERS

This critical edition of the letters attributed to Pythagorean women is that which was compiled by Alfons Städele, *Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, vol. 115; Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1980). Since my own translations are based on Städele's edition, and for convenience of referencing, I have retained here the order of the letters as well as his paragraph and line spacing. See the notes on my translations in Chapter One for further discussion of the diverse textual issues. For details on the manuscript variants, see Städele, *Die Briefe*, 160–178.

Μέλισσα Κλεαρέτῃ [χαίρειν].

1. Αὐτομάτως ἐμὶν φαίνη πλέονα τῶν καλῶν ἔχεν· τὸ γὰρ
3 ἐσπουδασμένως ἐθέλεν τὸ ἀκοῦσαι περὶ γυναικὸς εὐκοσμί-
ας καλὰν ἐλπίδα διδοῖ ὅτι μέλλεις πολιούσθαι κατ' ἄρε-
τάν. χρή ὦν τὰν σώφρονα καὶ ἐλευθέραν τῷ κατὰ νόμον ἀν-
6 δρὶ ποτῆμεν αἰσχύνῃ κεκαλλωπισμέναν [ἀλλὰ μὴ πολυτεδῶς],
ἦμεν δὲ τῇ ἐσθᾷ λευκοείμονα καὶ καθάριον καὶ ἀφελή,
ἀλλὰ μὴ πολυτελή καὶ περισσάν· παραιτητέον γὰρ αὐτῇ τὰν
9 ἀλουργή καὶ διαπόρφυρον καὶ τὰ χρυσόπαστα τῶν ἐνδυμά-
των. ταῖς ἐταίραις γὰρ τάδε χρήσιμα ποττὰν τῶν πλεόνων
θήραν, τὰς δὲ ποθ' ἓνα τὸν ἴδιον εὐαρεστούσας γυναικὸς
12 κόσμος ὁ τρόπος πέλει καὶ οὐχ αἱ στολαί· εὐμορφον γὰρ
τὰν ἐλευθέραν ἰδέσθαι τῷ αὐτὰς ἀνδρὶ, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῖς πλα-
σίον.
- 15 2. Ἐχοῖς ἂν ἐπὶ τὰς ὄψις ἐρύθαμα μὲν σαμεῖον αἰδοῦς
ἀντὶ φύκιος, καλοκαγαθίαν δὲ καὶ κοσμιότατα καὶ σωφρο-
σύναν ἀντὶ χρυσῷ καὶ σμαράγδῳ. οὐ γὰρ ἐς τὰν τὰς ἐσθᾷ-
18 τος πολυτέλειαν φιλοκαλεῖν δεῖ τὰν γλιχομένην τὰς σωφρο-
σύνας, ἀλλ' ἐς τὰν οἰκονομίαν τῷ οἴκῳ. ἀρέσκειν δὲ αὐτὰν
τῷ αὐτὰς ἀνδρὶ ἐπιτελέας ποιεύσαν τὰς ἐκείνῳ θελήσας·
21 αἱ γὰρ τῷ ἀνδρὸς θελήσεις νόμος ὁφείλει ἄγραφος ἦμεν κο-
σμίᾳ γυναικί, ποθ' ὃν χρή βιών αὐτάν· νομίζεν δὲ προῖκα
ποτενηγέχθαι ἅμα αὐτῇ καλλίσταν καὶ μεγίσταν τὰν εὐτα-

- 24 ξίαν. πιστεύεν γάρ χρη τῷ τὰς ψυχὰς κάλλει τε καὶ πλού-
 τῳ μάλλον ἢ τῷ τὰς ὕψιος καὶ τῶν χρημάτων. τὰ μὲν γάρ
 27 φθόνος καὶ νοῦσος παραιρέεται, τὰ δὲ μέχρι θανάτω πάρ-
 εντι ἐκτεταμένα.

Μυῖα φύλλιδι [χαίρειν].

1. Γενομένην τοι ματέρι παίδων τάδε παραινέω· τίτθαν μὲν
 3 ἐκλέξασθαι τὰν ἐπιταδαιοτάταν καὶ καθάριον, ἔτι δὲ αἰδή-
 μονα καὶ μὴ ὕπνω προσοικειουμέναν μηδὲ μὴν μέθῃ· ἃ τοιά-
 δε γὰρ ἂν κρίνοιτο κρατίστα ποττὸ ἐκτρέφεν ἐλευθέρως παί-
 6 δας, ἐάν γε δὴ γάλα τρόφιμον ἔχῃ καὶ μὴ ταῖς πρὸς ἄνδρα
 κοίταις εὐνίκατος πέλῃ. μεγάλα γὰρ μερίς ἐν τῷδε καὶ πρῶ-
 τα καὶ προκαταρκτικώτερα ἐς ὅλαν τὰν βιοτὰν πέλει ἐν τῇ
 9 τρεφοίσῃ ποττὸ καλῶς τραφήμεν· ποιήσει γὰρ πάντα καλὰ ἐν
 τῷ ποτεοικότη καὶ ρῶ.
 2. Τὸν τιτθὸν τε καὶ μαζὸν καὶ τροφὰν δόμεν μὴ καττὸ ἐπ-
 12 ενθόν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τινος προνοίας· οὕτως γὰρ ἐς ὑγίειαν
 ἄξει τὸ βρέφος. μὴ ὅτε αὐτὰ θέλει καθεῦθεν νικῆται, ἀλλ'
 ὁπότε ἂν τὸ νεογνὸν ἀναπαύσιος ἔρον ἔχῃ· οὐ μικρὸν γὰρ
 15 ἄκος τῷ παιδί προσοίσει. ἔστω δὲ μήτ' ὀργίλα τιθάνῃ μήτε
 πρόγλωσσος μήτε ἐν ταῖς τῶν σιτίων λήψεσιν ἀδιάφορος, ἀλ-
 λά τεταγμένα καὶ σώφρων, δυνατῶν δὲ ὄντων μὴ βάρβαρος ἀλ-
 18 λὰ Ἑλληνίς.
 3. Ἄριστον, ἐάν καὶ τοῦ γάλακτος χρηστῶς πιμπλάμενον (lac. indi-
 cavi)
 τὸ νεογνόν, οὕτως ἐς ὕπνον τρέπεσθαι. ἀδείῃ γὰρ νέοις ἂν
 21 εἶη καὶ εὐκατέργαστος ἃ τοιάδε σίτασις· αἱ δὲ κα χᾶτέραν,
 δόμεν χρητὴ ἀπλουστάταν. οἶνω δὲ τὸ παράπαν ἀπέχεσθαι τῷ δύ-
 ναμιν ἰσχυρὰν ἔχεν ἢ καττὸ σπάνιον μεταδιδόμεν τῇ κράσει
 24 δείελον γαλακτώδες. τὰ δὲ λουτρά μὴ ποιεῖν συνεχῇ· ἃ γὰρ
 τῶν σπανίων καὶ εὐκράτων χρᾶσις ἀμείνων.
 4. Κατταῦτὰ δὲ καὶ ἄῃρ ἐπιτάδειος θάλπους καὶ ῥίγους ἔχων
 27 τὰν συμμετρίαν, καὶ οἴκησις δὲ μήτε ἄγαν περιπνεομένα μή-
 τε ἄγαν κατὰστεγνος. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὕδωρ μήτε ἀπόσκληρον
 μήτε εὐπαράγωγον, καὶ στρωμνὰ δὲ οὐ τραχεῖα, ἀλλὰ προσπί-
 30 πτουσα τῷ χρωτὶ εὐαρμόστως· ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τούτοις τὸ οἰκεί-
 ον ἃ φύσις ἐπιποθεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ πολυτελές. ταῦτα μὲν ὦν
 ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος οὐκ ἀχρεῖον ὑπογράψαι τοι τὰς ἐλπίδος ἐκ

- 33 τροφᾶς [ῆ] καττὸ[ν] ὑφαγεόμενον γινομένης· θεῶ δὲ συλλαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῷ παιδὸς αὐθις τὰς ἐνδεχομένας καὶ ποτεοικυίας κομιούμεες ὑπομνάσεις.

Θεανῶ Εὐβούλῃ [χαίρειν].

1. Ἀκούω σε τὰ παιδία τρυφερῶς ἄγειν· ἔστι δὲ ἀγαθῆς μη-
- 3 τρὸς οὐχ ἡ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐπιμέλεια τῶν παιδῶν, ἀλλ' ἡ πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον ἀγωγή· βλέπε οὖν μὴ οὐ φιλούσης, ἀλλὰ κολακευούσης ἔργον ποιήσης· συντρεφομένη γὰρ ἡδονὴ παισὶν ἀκολάστους
- 6 ποιεῖ. τί γὰρ ἥδιον νέοις συνήθους ἡδονῆς; χρή οὖν, ὦ φίλη, τὴν τροφήν τῶν παιδῶν μὴ διαστροφὴν ἔχειν. ἡ δὲ τροφή διαστροφή τῆς φύσεώς ἐστιν ὅταν φιλήδονοι μὲν ταῖς ψυχαῖς,
- 9 ἡδυπαθεῖς δὲ τοῖς σώμασι γένωνται, καὶ ταῖς μὲν φυγόπονοι, τοῖς δὲ μαλακώτεροι.
2. Δεῖ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὰ φοβερά γυμνάζειν τὰ τρεφόμενα, κἂν
- 12 λυπηθῇναι κἂν πονῆσαι δέη, ἵνα μὴ τῶν παθῶν ἦ δοῦλα τούτων καὶ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς λίχνα καὶ περὶ τοὺς πόνους ὀκνηρά, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὰ καλὰ πρὸ πάντων τιμῶσιν, ὧν μὲν ἀπεχόμε-
- 15 νοι, τοῖς δὲ ἐμμένοντες. οὐδὲ πλησμονικὰ μὲν ταῖς τροφαῖς, πολυτελὴ δὲ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, ἀκόλαστα δὲ ταῖς ἀνέδην παιδικαῖς αὐτὰ ποιεῖν, καὶ πᾶν μὲν λέγειν, πᾶν δ' ἐπιτηδεύειν
- 18 ἐάσαι, ἔτι δὲ φοβουμένην μὲν, ἣν κλάιῃ, φιλοτιμουμένην δέ, ἣν γελᾷ, κἂν τὴν τροφὸν παίῃ κἂν σε κακῶς εἶπῃ γελῶσαν, καὶ τοῦ μὲν θέρους ψύχος, τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος καύμα παρέχου-
- 21 σαν καὶ πολλὴν χλιδὴν· ὧν οἱ πενιχροὶ γε παῖδες οὐδενὸς πειρῶνται, καὶ τρέφονται μὲν ῥᾶον, αὔξονται δὲ οὐχ ἥσσαν, διάκεινται δὲ παρὰ πολὺ κρεῖσσον.
- 24 3. Σὺ δ' οἷον Σαρδαναπάλλου γονὴν τιθηνῇ τὰ τέκνα, τὴν τῶν ἄρρένων φύσιν θρύπτουσα ταῖς ἡδοναῖς. τί γὰρ ἂν ποιήσειέ τις παιδίον, ὃ ἂν μὴ τάχιον φάγῃ κλαίει, κἂν ἐσθίῃ,
- 27 τὰ τερπνὰ τῶν ὕψων ζητεῖ, κἂν καῦμα (ῆ), παρίεται, κἂν ψύχος (lac.indicavi) πτωματίζει, κἂν ἐπιτιμᾷ τις, ἀντιμάχεται, κἂν μὴ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ὑπηρετῇ, λυπεῖται, κἂν μὴ μασᾷται δυσκολαί-
- 30 νει, καὶ κακοσχολεῖ πρὸς ἡδονὴν καὶ βαταλίζεται περιαγόμενον;
4. Ἐπιμελῶς δὴ, ὦ φίλη, εἰδυῖα ὅτι τὰ σπαταλῶντα τῶν παι-
- 33 δίων, ὅταν ἀκμάσῃ πρὸς ἄνδρας, ἀνδράποδα γίνεται, τὰς τοιαύτας ἡδονὰς ἀφαίρει, καὶ τὴν τροφήν αὐστηράν, μὴ τρυφερὰν

οὕτω ποιούσα καὶ ἐώσα καὶ λιμὸν καὶ δίψος ἐνεγκεῖν, ἔτι δὲ
 36 καὶ ψυχὸς καὶ θάλπος καὶ αἰδῶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν συνηλίκων ἢ τῶν
 ἐπιστατῶν· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ γεννικὰ εἶναι συμβαίνει κατὰ ψυχὴν
 ἀνατεινόμενα ἢ ἐπιτιμώμενα. οἱ γὰρ πόνοι, φίλη, προὔπουστυ-
 39 φαί τινες τοῖς παισὶν εἰσι τελειωθισομένης ἀρετῆς, αἷς ἐμ-
 βαφέντες ἀποχρώντως τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς βαφὴν οἰκειότερον φέρου-
 σιν. βλέπε οὖν, φίλη, μή, καθάπερ τῶν ἀμπέλων αἱ κακοτρο-
 42 φούμεναι τὸν καρπὸν ἐλλείπουσιν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς οἱ παῖ-
 δες ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ἀχρεϊότητος κακίαν γεννήσωσιν.

Θεανῶ Νικοστράτῃ [χαίρειν].

1. Ἦκουον τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρός σου παράνοιαν, ὅτι τὴν ἐταίραν
 3 ἔχει, σὺ δὲ ὅτι ζηλοτυπεῖς αὐτόν. ἐγὼ δέ, ὦ φίλη, πολλοὺς
 ἔγνωκα τῆς αὐτῆς νόσου· θηρεύονται γὰρ ὡς ἔοικεν ὑπὸ τῶν
 γυναικῶν τούτων καὶ κατέχονται καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι νοῦν. σὺ δὲ
 6 ἄθυμος εἶ καὶ νύκτα καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀδημονεῖς καὶ μη-
 χανᾷ τι κατ' αὐτοῦ· μὴ σύ γε, ὦ φίλη· γαμετῆς γὰρ ἀρετῇ
 ἐστὶν οὐχ ἢ παρατήρησις τάνδρος, ἀλλ' ἢ συμπεριφορά· συμ-
 9 περιφορὰ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ φέρειν ἄγνοιαν. εἴθ' ἐταίρα μὲν πρὸς
 ἡδονὴν ὁμιλεῖ, γαμετῇ δὲ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον· συμφέρον δὲ κα-
 κοῖς κακὰ μὴ μίσγειν μηδὲ παρανοίᾳ παράνοιαν ἐπάγειν.
12. Ἐνια δὲ ἀμαρτήματα, φίλη, ἐλεγχόμενα μὲν ἐπὶ πλέον ἀν-
 ερεθίζεται, σιωπώμενα δὲ παύεται μάλλον, ὥς τὸ πῦρ ἡσυχία
 φασὶ σβέννυσθαι. ἐὰν γὰρ βουλόμενόν σε λεληθέναι δοκεῖν
 15 ἐλέγχουσα ἀφαιρήσῃς τὸ παρακάλυμμα τοῦ πάθους, καὶ φανε-
 ρῶς ἀμαρτήσεται. σὺ δὲ τὴν φιλίαν ἡγή (lac.indicavi) τοῦ ἀνδρός οὐκ
 ἐν τῇ καλοκαγαθίᾳ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ χάρις τῆς κοινωνίας. νόμι-
 18 ζε οὖν πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἐταίραν βραθυμήσοντα πορεύεσθαι ἐκεί-
 νον, σοὶ δὲ συμβιῶσαντα παρῆναι, καὶ σὲ μὲν φιλεῖν κατὰ
 γνῶμην, ἐκείνην δὲ τῷ πάθει.
21. Βραχὺς δὲ ὁ τούτου καιρὸς· ἅμα γὰρ ἀκμὴν ἔχει καὶ κό-
 ρον, καὶ παρίσταται ταχὺ καὶ παύεται. ὀλιγοχρόνιος γὰρ ὁ
 ἔρως ἐστὶ πρὸς ἐταίραν ἀνδρὶ μὴ σφόδρα κακῷ· τί γὰρ ἐστὶ
 24 ματαιότερον ἐπιθυμίας ἀπολαυούσης ἀδίκου; διὸ καὶ μειῶν
 τὸν βίον καὶ διαβάλλων τὸ εὖσχημον αἰσθανθήσεται ποτε·
 οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐπιμένει φρονῶν αὐθαιρέτῳ βλάβῃ. καλούμενος
 27 οὖν ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸς σε δικαίων καὶ τὰς περὶ τὸν βίον ἐλαττω-
 σεις ὁρῶν [αἰσθήσεται ποτέ σου] καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς καταγνώ-
 σεως ὕβριν οὐ φέρων ταχὺ μεταγνώσεται.

30 4. Σὺ δέ, φίλη, ζῆθι οὐχ ἑταίραις ἀποκρινομένη, τῇ μὲν εὐ-
ταξίᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα διαφέρουσα, τῇ δὲ ἐπιμελείᾳ πρὸς τὸν
οἶκον, τῇ δὲ συναλλαγῇ περὶ τὰς χρωμένας, τῇ δὲ φιλοστορ-
33 γίᾳ περὶ τὰ τέκνα. οὐ ζηλοτυπητέον οὖν σοι πρὸς ἐκείνην
(πρὸς γὰρ τὰς ἐναρέτους ἐκτείνειν τὸν ζῆλον καλόν), ἑαυ-
τὴν δὲ παρεκτέον ἐπιτηδεῖαν ταῖς διαλλαγαῖς· τὰ γὰρ καλὰ
36 ἦθῃ καὶ παρ' ἐχθροῖς εὖνοιαν φέρει, φίλη, καὶ μόνῃς καλο-
καγαθίας ἔργον ἐστὶν ἡ τιμή, ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ δυνατὸν ἄνδρὸς
ἐξουσίαν καθυπερέχειν γυναικί καὶ τιμᾶσθαι πλέον ἢ θερα-
39 πεύειν τὸν ἐχθρόν.

5. Κατερούμενος γοῦν ὑπὸ σοῦ μάλλον αἰσχύνεται, τάχιον
δὲ διαλλαγῇναι θελήσει, προσπαθέστερον δὲ φιλοστοργήσει
42 συνεγνωκῶς τὴν ἀδικίαν τὴν εἰς σέ, κατανοῶν τε τὴν προσ-
οχὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ βίου καὶ πείραν τῆς στοργῆς λαμβάνων τῆς πρὸς
αὐτόν. ὥσπερ δὲ αἱ κακοπάθειαι τοῦ σώματος ἡδεῖας τὰς ἀνα-
45 παύσεις ποιοῦσιν, οὕτως αἱ διαφοραὶ τῶν φίλων οἰκιοτέρας
τὰς διαλλαγὰς φέρουσιν.

6. Σὺ δὲ καὶ τὰ βουλευόμενα τοῦ πάθους ἀντίθες· νοσοῦντος
48 γὰρ ἐκείνου καὶ σέ παρακαλεῖ νοσεῖν ταῖς λύπαις, καὶ ἀμαρ-
τάνοντος περὶ τὸ εὖσχημον καὶ σέ περὶ τὸν κόσμον ἀμαρτάν-
νειν, καὶ καταβλάπτοντος τὸν βίον καὶ σέ καταβλάπτειν τὸ
51 συμφέρον. ἀφ' ὧν ἐπ' αὐτὸν συντετάχθαι δόξεις καὶ κολαζο-
μένη ἐκείνον καὶ σεαυτὴν κολάζειν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀφεμένη πο-
ρεύσῃ, ἐτέρου ἄρα πειραθήσῃ ἄνδρὸς τοῦ προτέρου ἀπαλλαγεῖ-
54 σα, κἂν ἐκεῖνος ἀμάρτη τὰ ὅμοια, πάλιν ἄλλου (οὐ φορητῇ
γὰρ νέαις χηρεῖα), ἢ μόνῃ μενεῖς ἀπ' ἄνδρὸς οἷόν περ ἄζυξ.

7. Ἄλλ' ἀμελήσεις τοῦ οἴκου καὶ καταφθερεῖς τὸν ἄνδρα; ἐπ-
57 ωδύνου ἄρα βίου συνδιαίρησιν τὴν βλάβην. ἀλλ' ἀμυνεῖ τὴν
ἑταίραν; περιστήσεται σε φυλαττομένη, κἂν ἀμύνη, μάχιμός
ἐστὶν οὐκ ἐρυθρίωσα γυνή. ἀλλὰ καλὸν ὅσημέραι μάχεσθαι πρὸς
60 τὸν ἄνδρα; καὶ τί πλέον; αἱ γὰρ μάχαι καὶ αἱ λοιδορίαι τὴν
μὲν ἀκολασίαν οὐ παύουσιν, τὴν δὲ διαφορὰν ταῖς προκοπαῖς
αὖξουσιν. τί δέ; βουλευέσῃ τι κατ' ἐκείνου; μή, φίλη, ζηλο-
63 τυπίας κρατεῖν ἢ τραγωδίᾳ ἐδίδαξε δραμάτων ἔχουσα σύνταξιν,
ἐν οἷς παρηνόμησε Μῆδεια. ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τῆς νόσου τῶν ὀφθαλ-
μῶν ἀπέχειν δεῖ τὰς χεῖρας, οὕτως καὶ σὺ τοῦ πάθους χώρι-
66 ζε τὴν προσποίησιν· διακαρτεροῦσα γὰρ θάττον τὸ πάθος σβέ-
σεις.

Θεανώ Καλλιστοί.

1. Ταῖς νεωτέραις ὑμῖν ἢ μὲν ἐξουσία παρὰ τοῦ νόμου δέδο-
 3 ται τῶν οἰκετῶν ἄρχειν ἅμα τῷ γήμασθαι, ἢ δὲ διδασκαλία πα-
 ρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀπαντᾶν ὀφείλει περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας αἰεὶ
 παραινούντων. καλῶς γὰρ ἔχει πρότερον μαρθάνειν ἢ μὴ γιγνώ-
 6 σκετε καὶ τὴν συμβουλὴν οἰκαιοτάτην τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἡγεί-
 σθαι· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ παρθενοτροφεῖσθαι δεῖ νέαν ψυχὴν. ἀρ-
 χὴ δὲ ἐστὶν οἴκου πρώτη γυναιξὶν ἀρχὴ θεραπειῶν. ἔστι δέ,
 9 ὧ φίλη, μέγιστον ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ εὐνοια· αὕτη γὰρ οὐ συναγορά-
 ζεται τοῖς σώμασιν ἢ κτήσις, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὑστέρου γεννώσιν αὐ-
 τὴν οἱ συνετοὶ δεσπόται.
- 12 2. Δικαία δὲ χρήσις αἰτία τούτου, ἵνα μήτε διὰ τὸν κόπον
 κάμνωσι, μήτε ἀδυνατώσι διὰ τὴν ἔνδειαν· εἰσὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι
 τῇ φύσει. ἔναι δὲ κέρδος τὸ ἀκερδέστατον ἡγούνται, τὴν τῶν
 15 θεραπειῶν κακουχίαν, βαρύνουσαι μὲν τοῖς ἔργοις, ὑποστει-
 λόμεναι δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων· εἴτα ὀβολοιᾶ κέρδη περιποιού-
 μεναι μεγάλοις ζημιοῦνται τιμήμασι, δυσνοαῖς καὶ ἐπιβου-
 18 λαῖς κακίσταις. σοὶ δὲ πρόχειρον ἔστω τὸ μέτρημα τῶν σιτί-
 ῶν πρὸς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῆς ἐριουργίας τοῖς ἐφ' ἡμέραν πόνοις.
3. Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τὴν δίκαιαν οὕτως· πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἀταξίας τὸ
 21 σοὶ πρέπον, οὐ τὸ ἐκείναις συμφέρον ἐξυπηρετητέον. τιμὰν
 μὲν γὰρ δεῖ θεραπαίνας τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὧμὸν οὐκ
 οἶσει τῷ θυμῷ χάριν, τὸ δὲ μισοπόνηρον οὐχ ἦττον ὁ λογισμὸς
 24 βραβεύει. ἐὰν δὲ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς κακίας ἀνίκητος ᾖ, ἐξορι-
 στέον μετὰ πράσεως· τὸ γὰρ ἀλλότριον τῆς χρείας ἀλλοτρι-
 ούσθω καὶ τῆς κυρίας. ἔστω δέ σοι γνώμη τοῦδε πρόεδρος,
 27 καθ' ἣν γνώσῃ τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς τῆς ἁμαρτίας πρὸς τὸ τῆς κα-
 ταγνώσεως δίκαιον, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων μέγεθος πρὸς τὸ
 κατ' ἀξίαν τῆς κολάσεως.
- 30 4. Δεσποτικὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ γνώμη [χάρις] ἐφ' ἡμαρτημένοις ζη-
 μίας ἀπαλλάττουσα· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ πρέπον ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκείου
 κατὰ τὸν τρόπον διαφυλάξει. ἔναι γάρ, ὧ φίλη, ὕπ' ὧμότη-
 33 τος καὶ μαστιζοῦσι τὰ τῶν θεραπειῶν σώματα, θηριούμεναι
 διὰ ζῆλον ἢ θυμὸν, οἷον ὑπομνηματογραφούμεναι τὴν ὑπερβο-
 λὴν τῆς πικρίας· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀνηλώθησαν χρόνῳ διαπονούμεναι,
 36 αἱ δὲ φυγῇ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐπορίσαντο, τινὲς δὲ ἐπαύσαντο τοῦ
 ζῆν αὐτόχειρι θανάτῳ μεταστᾶσαι, καὶ λοιπὸν ἡ τῆς δεσποίνης
 μόνωσις ὀδυρομένης τὴν οἰκίαν ἀβουλίαν ἔρημον μετάνοιαν
 39 ἔχει.

5. Ἄλλ', ὧ φίλῃ, ἴσθι μιμουμένη τὰ ὄργανα, ἃ (δια)φωνεῖ
μᾶλλον ἀνειμένα, ἐκρήττεται δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπιτεινόμενα. καὶ
42 γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν θεραπαινῶν ταυτόν· ἢ μὲν ἄγαν ἀνεσις διαφωνί-
αν ἐμποιεῖ τῆς πειθαρχίας, ἢ δὲ ἐπίτασις τῆς ἀνάγκης διά-
λυσιν τῆς φύσεως. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου δεῖ νοεῖν, μέτρον δ'
45 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστον. [ἔρρωσο.]

APPENDIX B

TRANSLATED SELECTIONS FROM THE PASTORAL LETTERS

The following annotated translations deal with the portions of the Pastorals where women and “feminine” issues are explicitly discussed. Whatever the original sequence of the Pastorals, the teachings for and about women have historically been read against the background not only of that small collection but also of the entire Pauline corpus. For that reason, as well as for ease of reference, my translations appear in what is now their canonical order. These passages receive more complete interpretations in the chapters that follow, and I will not duplicate the Greek text at those points.

1 TIM 1:9

... knowing this, that the law is not laid down for the just person, but for the lawless and insubordinate¹ persons, for the impious and sinners, wicked and profane, for father-killers and mother-killers, murderers ...²

1 TIM 2:8–3:1A³

Therefore, I want the men in every place to pray by lifting holy hands, without anger and dispute. Likewise also [I want] women to adorn themselves in

¹ The word translated here is ἀνυποτάκτος, which evokes the commands for women to learn in subordination (ὑποταγή) in 1Tim 2:11, and to be subordinate (ὑποτάσσειν) in Titus 2:5. Congregational overseers are also to have their children in subordination (1Tim 3:4).

² εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται, ἀνόμοιοι δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἀσεβέσι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς, ἀνοσίοις καὶ βεβήλοις, πατρολῶναις καὶ μητρολῶναις, ἀνδροφόνους. This verse is related to my project in that it signifies the cultural worldview of the author, which relies on sex-differentiation as well as on respect of children for their parents.

³ I include 3:1a as part of this text because the phrase is consistently used in reference to soteriological statements, as Wagener has demonstrated (*Die Ordnung*, 69–89). She reads the πιστὸς ὁ λόγος affirmation of 1Tim 3:1a as the closing statement of the pericope because each time the phrase is used in the Pastorals, it affirms a statement about salvation (ibid., 70–71; where there is also a brief summary of the scholarship on this topic). Merz offers another review of the scholarship, and comes to the same conclusion as to the ending of the text-unit (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 271–272).

decorous bearing with modesty and *sōphrosynē*, not in braided hair and gold or pearls or expensive clothing, but what is proper for women who profess godly-piety, through good works. Let a woman learn in silence in all subordination; but I do not permit a woman to teach, nor to have authority over a man, but to remain silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, having been thoroughly deceived, has been in⁴ transgression; but she will be saved through child-bearing, if they remain⁵ in faith and in love and in holiness with *sōphrosynē*. Faithful is the saying.⁶

1TIM 3:1B–13

If any man aspires [to the] office of overseer, he desires a good work. It is necessary for the overseer to be irreproachable, husband of one wife, sober, *sōphron*, decorous, hospitable, skilled at teaching, not addicted to wine, not a bully, but tolerant, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money, presiding well over his own house, having children in subjection with every dignity (but if someone does not know how to preside over his own household, how shall he take care of the assembly of God?), not a neophyte, so that, becoming conceited, he might fall into the condemnation of the devil. And he must also have a good testimony from those outside, so that he might

⁴ The verb γίνομαι used with ἐν expresses a “state of being” (BDAG, s.v. γίνομαι). The Perfect γέγονεν conveys “completed action with permanent result” (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1852b).

⁵ The author switches from a singular σωθήσεται in the apodosis of this conditional statement to the plural μείνωσιν in the protasis. Although there is no textual variant for the word μείνωσιν, an issue of interpretation arises in determining the subject of the subjunctive: does the author mean that “women” or “their children” need to remain in this virtuous state? Merz claims that both the singular and plural verbs refer to women (*Die fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 301–303). Wagener concludes similarly that both verbs likely have women as their subject, because the entire passage contains instructions for women (*Die Ordnung*, 107–108). For a succinct explanation of the options, see Bassler, *1 Timothy*, 61. I analyze this problem further in Chapter Five.

⁶ Βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ· ὡσαύτως καὶ γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι’ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν. γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ· διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρός, ἀλλ’ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὕα· καὶ ὁ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν, σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης. πιστὸς ὁ λόγος.

not fall into disgrace and the snare of the devil. Deacons⁷ likewise to be dignified, not insincere, not addicted to much wine, not fond of shameful gain, holding the mystery of the faith in a clean conscience. And let them be tested first, then let them serve [as deacons⁸] if they are irreproachable. Likewise [it is necessary] for women⁹ to be dignified, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let deacons be husbands of one wife, presiding well over children and their own household; for those who have served well [as deacons] acquire for themselves a good standing and much confidence in the faith in Christ Jesus.¹⁰

1 TIM 4:1–7

The spirit explicitly says that in the latter times some will withdraw from the faith, following deceptive spirits and teachings of demons, by the insincerity of liars whose own conscience is seared, who forbid marrying and to abstain from foods, which God created for sharing with thanksgiving by the ones who are faithful and who know the truth. Because everything created of God is good, and nothing should be rejected when it is received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. By setting forth these things to the brothers and sisters¹¹ you will be a good servant¹² of Christ Jesus,

⁷ Here the word *διάκονος* might be translated “servant” in order to maintain consistency with 1 Tim 4:6 (see next passage). But see n. 12.

⁸ A word-play emerges linking the activity of *διακονεῖν* given to those in the office of the *διάκονος*.

⁹ See my discussion in Chapter 7 of this word in the section on vices and virtues.

¹⁰ εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ. δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπιλήμπτου εἶναι, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, φιλόξενον, διδασκτικόν, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην, ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικῆ, ἄμαχον, ἀφιλάργυρον, τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος. (εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται;), μὴ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθείς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου. δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου. Διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνοῦς, μὴ διλόγους, μὴ οἶνω πολλῷ προσέχοντας, μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει. καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, εἴτα διακονεῖτωσαν ἀνεγκλιῆτοι ὄντες. γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς, μὴ διαβόλους, νηφαλίους, πιστάς ἐν πᾶσιν. διάκονοι ἔστωσαν μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρες, τέκνων καλῶς προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἰκῶν· οἱ γὰρ καλῶς διακονήσαντες βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιούνται καὶ πολλὴν παρρησίαν ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

¹¹ I have translated “and sisters” because “Timothy” has been appointed as teacher for the entire congregation; cf. also, 1 Tim 5:1–2, where his role is described vis-à-vis both men and women.

¹² As in 1 Tim 3:8–13, the word *διάκονος* is used. However, I have chosen the more general meaning of “servant” here, while preserving the title of “deacon” in the earlier verses. As Timothy’s role is prescribed, he functions in a more elevated role as an apostolic delegate and teacher of teachers. This does not appear to be the office of “deacon.”

nourished by the words of the faith and of the good teaching which you have followed. But refuse profane and old womanly myths.¹³

1TIM 5:1–2

Do not rebuke an older man, but encourage [him] as a father, younger men as brothers, older women as mothers, younger women as sisters in all purity.¹⁴

1TIM 5:3–16

Honor as widows those who are really widows. But if some widow has children or grandchildren,¹⁵ let them learn¹⁶ first to show piety to their own household and to make a return to their progenitors. For this is acceptable in the presence of God. But the real widow, even though she has been left alone,¹⁷ has hope in God, and continues in supplications and prayers night

¹³ Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάλημψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον, ἀγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως. Ταῦτα ὑποτιθέμενος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καλὸς ἔσθι διάκονος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ἣ παρηκολούθηκας· τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γραῶδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ. The author depicts the opposition as being fascinated with μῦθοι (1 Tim 1:4; 2 Tim 4:4; Titus 1:14), and in these verses links them explicitly to women by means of the word γραῶδης.

¹⁴ Πρεσβυτέρω μὴ ἐπιπλήξης, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα, νεωτέρους ὡς ἀδελφούς, πρεσβυτέρας ὡς μητέρας, νεωτέρας ὡς ἀδελφάς ἐν πάσῃ ἀγνείᾳ. This verse exhibits the author's predilection for dividing his assembly along the lines of both age and gender. Among the *Corpus Paulinum*, the emphasis on various age groups is distinctive to the Pastorals.

¹⁵ BDAG states that while this may indicate “descendants” generally, the more specific understanding is “grandchildren,” s.v. ἔκγονος.

¹⁶ One textual variant makes the word *μανθανέτωσαν* singular (*μανθανέτω*) in order to deal with the discrepancy that the verse begins with a singular subject and verb, *τις χήρα* ... ἔχει, but the imperative is plural in form, somehow being attracted to the number of the objects, *τέκνα* ἢ ἔκγονα. The plural “let them learn” clearly makes more sense with the part of the clause “to make a return to their *progenitors* [πρόγονος].” As Dibelius and Conzelmann remark, “The old interpretation, which supplies ‘the widows’ as the subject of the clause ‘they shall learn,’ is made impossible by the term ‘to show piety’ (εὐσεβεῖν), which is a variant of the word ‘to honor’ (τιμάν), and by the term ‘forebears’ (προγόνοις). Therefore, the ‘members of the family’ must be seen as the subject of ‘they shall learn.’ The change of the subject can be explained as a brachylogy” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 74).

¹⁷ The participle *μεμονωμένη* is not covered by the definite article as is *ὄντως*, and is

and day, while the widow¹⁸ who is living luxuriously, although living, has died. So command these things, in order that they might be irreproachable.¹⁹ If someone does not have forethought for their own people and most of all those of their household, they have denied the faith and are worse than an unbeliever.²⁰ Let a widow be enrolled who has lived not less than sixty years, a wife of one husband, attested by good works: if she raised children, if she showed hospitality, if she washed the saints' feet, if she helped the afflicted, if she was devoted to every good work. But refuse [to enroll] younger widows,²¹ for when they feel sensuous impulses that alienate them from Christ,²² they wish to marry, incurring judgment because they nullified the first vow.²³ At the same time they are learning unproductively,²⁴ going around from house to house, and not only being unproductive, but also gossips and busybodies, saying things that should not be [said]. Therefore, I want²⁵ the

preceded by καί, and I have chosen to construe it concessively. Smyth notes that καί does appear with participles of concession, although less frequently than καίπερ and καί ταῦτα (*Greek Grammar*, §§ 2066, 2083; for an example of concession using καί in a genitive absolute, see § 2070c).

¹⁸ This feminine participle signifies not just women in general, but widows in particular.

¹⁹ The shift to a plural masculine subject returns to the children and grandchildren of the widows as the recipients of the commands.

²⁰ I have replaced plural subjects for the singular verb forms in this sentence for purposes of gender-inclusivity: this author is not restricting financial support of widows to male progeny only. Cf. also 5:16.

²¹ παραιτέομαι with the accusative of person, means "reject, refuse someone or refuse to do someth. to someone ..." (BDAG, s.v. παραιτέομαι).

²² Unknown in any Greek text outside of 1 Tim 5:11, the word καταστρηνιάω is related to στρηνιάω, meaning to "run riot/wild, become/wax wanton" (BDAG, s.v. καταστρηνιάω). The sexual connotations of the verb are generally accepted; see, among many others, Wagener, *Die Ordnung*, 201–202; Winter, *Roman Wives*, 128–137; M.Y. MacDonald, *Early Christian Women*, 157–162. For this verse, I have adopted the lengthy suggestion from BDAG. The term is clearly not commendable of these women. Interpretation of this verse is also challenging in that these younger widows "wish to marry," which is clearly the author's wish as well. The problem must be that the women would violate some Christian vow they have taken. Wagener views the "first vow" as a vow of asceticism, and understands the author's command for the younger widows to marry as part of his polemic against opponents who favor the ascetical life (*Die Ordnung*, 201–204).

²³ This occurrence of πίστις is difficult to translate. BDAG has this instance in its own category: "a solemn promise to be faithful and loyal," s.v. πίστις. My choice of "vow" suggests the idea of "marriage vow," and corresponds to "assurance, oath, troth," from BDAG.

²⁴ The word ἀργός is usually translated "idle" here, but another meaning relates "to being unproductive, useless, worthless" (BDAG, s.v. ἀργός). As I explicate in Chapter Five, I have been persuaded to this translation by Wagener's exegesis, which relates the "unproductive learning" of the younger widows to that of the *gunaikaria* in 2 Tim 3:6–7.

²⁵ This command is reinforced by the strong first-person singular finite verb.

younger [widows]²⁶ to marry, to bear children, to manage a household,²⁷ to give no opportunity to the opponent for reproach; for already some have turned away after Satan. If some believing woman²⁸ has widows, let her aid them, and let the assembly not be burdened, so it might aid the real widows.²⁹

2 TIM 1:5

... remembering the sincere faith in you [Timothy], which dwelt first in your grandmother Lois and in your mother Eunice, and I am convinced³⁰ that [it dwells] also in you.³¹

²⁶ I supply “widows” here because of the earlier references to the age groups of widows, vv. 9 and 11. In addition, the author has established such a negative image of the younger widows that v. 14 must serve as the positive solution for the reprehensible conduct in vv. 11–13. Since the word *χήρα* applies to divorced women (*Theano to Nikostrate*) as well as to a woman bereft even of her household slaves (*Theano to Kallisto*), we cannot determine the exact marital status of these νεωτέραι.

²⁷ The verb is used in later Christian commentaries on this particular verse; otherwise, it appears most often in astrological texts where planets “predominate,” LSJ, s.v. *οικοδεσποτέω*. Note the triad of feminine roles that mirror the social expectation for men (husband, father, master), and that are then linked to a fourth infinitive διδόναι: “to give no opportunity to the opponent.”

²⁸ This unusual feminine substantive indicates a woman caring for a group of widows, such as Tabitha and the widows she gave clothing to mentioned in Acts 9:39, 41.

²⁹ *Χήρας τίμα τὰς ὄντως χήρας. εἰ δέ τις χήρα τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα ἔχει, μανθανέτωσαν πρῶτον τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν καὶ ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα καὶ μεμονωμένη ἡλπιεν ἐπὶ θεὸν καὶ προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσιν καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας· ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα ζῶσα τέθνηκεν. καὶ ταῦτα παράγγελλε, ἵνα ἀνεπιλημπτοὶ ᾧσιν. εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖται, τὴν πίστιν ἥρνηται καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστου χεῖρων. Χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγονυῖα, ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή, ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη, εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, εἰ ἐξενοδόγησεν, εἰ ἀγίῳ πόδας ἐνίψεν, εἰ θλιβομένοις ἐπήρκεσεν, εἰ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησεν. νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας παραιτοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ καταστρηγιάσωσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμεῖν θέλουσιν, ἔχουσαι κρίμα ὅτι τὴν πρῶτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν· ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσιν, περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀργαὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ φλύαροι καὶ περίεργοι, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δεόντα. βούλομαι οὖν νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν, οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν· ἥδη γάρ τινες ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ. εἴ τις πιστὴ ἔχει χήρας, ἐπαρκεῖται αὐταῖς, καὶ μὴ βαρεῖσθω ἢ ἐκκλησία, ἵνα ταῖς ὄντως χήραις ἐπαρκεσθῇ.*

³⁰ The perfect conveys a present meaning; BDAG, s.v. *πίθω*.

³¹ *ὕπόμνησιν λαβὼν τῆς ἐν σοὶ ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως, ἥτις ἐνώκησεν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ μάμμῃ σου Λωΐδι καὶ τῇ μητρὶ σου Εὐνίκῃ, πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοὶ.*

2 TIM 3:6–7

For among these men³² are those who enter³³ houses and capture frivolous women³⁴ who are loaded up³⁵ with sins, being led by various desires, always learning and never able to come to a knowledge of truth.³⁶

2 TIM 4:19

Greet Prisca and Aquila and the household of Onesiphorus. Erastus remained at Corinth; I left Trophimus sick in Miletus. Come quickly before winter. Eubulus and Pudens and Linus and Claudia and all the brothers and sisters greet you.³⁷

TITUS 1:5–6

For this purpose I left you in Crete: that you might set right the remaining matters, and might appoint elders³⁸ in each city, as I commanded you. If some man³⁹ is blameless, husband of one wife, having faithful children who

³² Although the masculine pronoun might indicate both men and women, these persons “enter houses and capture frivolous *women*,” so I have chosen to keep the translation of τούτων (and the participles that follow) exclusively masculine.

³³ ἐνδύνειν, which is a variation of ἐνδύειν, often has a negative connotation: “slip in,” “creep in,” or, in the middle, “insinuate oneself,” LSJ 562, s.v. ἐνδύω. Surely the author here accuses the opponents of some shady activity.

³⁴ Another NT hapax legomenon, this diminutive “little women” carries a disparaging meaning, as shown in the two participial phrases that follow (BDAG, s.v. γυναικάριον). I have selected “frivolous” to get across the impulsiveness the author perceives in these women. I think of γυναικάρια as somewhat akin to the modern term “chicks,” as in “chick flick,” or “chick lit,” which tend to connote younger women with lightweight intellectual interests.

³⁵ This word appears in the NT only here and in Rom 12:20, where it is used to describe the “heaping up” of burning coals on the head of an enemy. It thus connotes being “overwhelmed” (BDAG, s.v. σωρεύω).

³⁶ ἐκ τούτων γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις, ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις, πάντοτε μανθάνοντα καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἔλθειν δυνάμενα. The “learning disability” of these women is echoed in the activities of the younger widows of 1 Tim 5:13, see above.

³⁷ Ἀσπασαί Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν καὶ τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον. Ἐραστός ἔμεινεν ἐν Κορίνθῳ, Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα. Σπούδασον πρὸ χειμῶνος ἔλθειν. Ἀσπάζεται σε Εὐβούλος καὶ Πούδης καὶ Λίνος καὶ Κλαυδία καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες.

³⁸ The author begins with instructions related to “elders” (πρεσβύτεροι), but shifts in verse 7 to the “overseer” (ἐπίσκοπος).

³⁹ Once again, preserving the masculine gender of the pronoun seems called for given the instructions that follow.

are not under an accusation of debauchery nor being disobedient. For it is necessary that the overseer, as God's household-manager, be irreproachable, not self-willed, not quick-tempered, not drunken, not a bully, not fond of shameful gain, but hospitable, loving what is good, *sōphrōn*, just, devout, self-controlled, holding fast to the faithful word according to the teaching,⁴⁰ so that he might be able both to exhort in the healthy teaching and to censure⁴¹ those who speak against it.⁴²

TITUS 2:1–10

But you [Titus] say⁴³ what is appropriate for the healthy teaching: that older men⁴⁴ are to be sober, dignified, *sōphron*, healthy in faith, in love, in patience. Older women⁴⁵ likewise⁴⁶ [are to be] in a reverent demeanor, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, good teachers,⁴⁷ so that they might instruct⁴⁸

⁴⁰ The word διδαχή here and διδασκαλία at the end of the verse appear to be synonymous. The latter is the more common term in the Pastorals: 1 Tim 1:10; 4:1, 6, 13, 16; 5:17; 6:1; 2 Tim 3:1, 10; 4:3; and Titus 2:1, 7. Cf. BDAG, s.v. διδαχή and διδασκαλία.

⁴¹ "To censure" translates ἐλέγχειν in a way that links this action with that of *Theano* to *Nikostrate*, where the word is also used.

⁴² Τούτου χάριν ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ καὶ καταστήσῃ κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διευταξάμην, εἴ τίς ἐστιν ἀνέγκλητος, μιάς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ, τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα. δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον, μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ ὀργίλον, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην, μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ, ἀλλὰ φιλόξενον, φιλάγαθον, σώφρονα, δίκαιον, ὅσιον, ἐγκρατῆ, ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου, ἵνα δυνατὸς ᾖ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν.

⁴³ This λάλει forms an *inclusio* with the same word in 2:5.

⁴⁴ Instead of the more common πρεσβύτερος, Titus 2:2 has πρεσβύτες.

⁴⁵ The Greek is πρεσβῦτις, rather than the feminine of πρεσβύτερος (cf. 1 Tim 5:2).

⁴⁶ A favorite word in the Pastorals, ὡσαύτως occurs here and at 2:6; also, 1 Tim 2:9; 3:8, 11; 5:25.

⁴⁷ Quinn translates the word καλοδιδάσκαλοι as the phrase "they are the right teachers," while Spicq chooses "enseignant le bien" (*Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 621). Dibelius and Conzelmann have "teachers of all good things" (*Pastoral Epistles*, 140). Bassler offers both: "good teachers" or, more likely, those who 'teach what is good' (NRSV) (*1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*, 194). Johnson uses "they should be effective teachers," (*Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 230).

⁴⁸ The verb σωφρονίζειν is a NT hapax legomenon. An important variant has the indicative σωφρονίζουσιν, rather than the subjunctive. Although the indicative would be the more difficult reading, the ἵνα establishes the need for a subjunctive, which practice the Pastorals usually follow (Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 120), and NA27 reads the subjunctive. The question is not particularly crucial for my argument, since in either case, the older women are identified as the subjects of the action and the young women as the objects.

This denominative verb-form (with the -ίζω ending) "denotes action" (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 866.6), and so has a transitive sense, taking the "young women" as the direct object(s) of the action. (This is in contrast to the intransitive σωφρονεῖν, "to be of sound mind, to be

the young women⁴⁹ in *sōphrosynē*, to be loving of husbands,⁵⁰ loving of children, *sōphrōn*, pure, good⁵¹ house-workers,⁵² subordinated⁵³ to their own husbands, so that the word of God might not be defamed. The younger men likewise exhort to be *sōphron* in all respects, by offering yourself as an example of good works,⁵⁴ being uncorrupted in the teaching, [having] dignity, beyond reproach in the healthy teaching, so that the opponent might be put to shame, having nothing base to say about us. Slaves are to be subordinate to their own masters in everything, to be well-pleasing,

sensible" (BDAG, s.v. *σωφρονέω*); this form is found just two verses later in reference to the younger men). Literally it means to "recall a person to his senses" (LSJ, s.v. *σωφρονίζω*), or "to instruct in prudence or behavior that is becoming and shows good judgment" (BDAG, s.v. *σωφρονίζω*). Spicq offers the translation "afin qu'elles éduquent dans la sagesse ..." (*Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 621). Quinn has "for spurring on" (*Letter to Titus*, 120). Johnson translates simply "so that they might advise" (*Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 230). Winter gives an overview of the range of meanings (*Roman Wives*, 155–159). The NRSV reads "so that they may encourage." Dibelius and Conzelmann have "Then they can advise ..." (*Pastoral Epistles*, 139).

⁴⁹ The comparative *νέωτερος* is not used here (as in 1 Tim 5:2), only the simple adjective *νέος*.

⁵⁰ The strongest parallel to this list of women's duties comes from Philo, who also uses *φιλότεκνος*, and elsewhere "describes wives as 'sensible, tending the hearth, and loving their husbands (*sōphronas oikourous kai philandrous*)'" (Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 120; citing and translating *Praem.* 139).

⁵¹ The next translation issue is whether "good" stands alone as a virtue or modifies *οικουργούς*. Metzger equivocates: "The text may be punctuated with or without a comma after *οικουργούς*" (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2nd ed.; New York; London: UBS, 1971], 654). Quinn prefers to view the word on its own because of the "formal structure of the list, which is adjectival to *neai* and septuple. Only here in the PE does *agathos* directly qualify a person; usually works are so described ..." (*Letter to Titus*, 122). However, Quinn allows that the literary form signifies that a woman who is *agathē* will be so both within the context of the household, in her role as *οικουργός*, as well as in her marriage, when she is subordinate to her own husband (ibid., 121). I am skeptical about the number seven, since the author of the Pastorals does not seem to count up the vices or virtues that he uses. The Pastorals' continual emphasis on household management leads me to read the adjective as modifying "house-workers."

⁵² The word *οικουργούς* ("working at home" or "busy at home") is uncommon, and some manuscripts have instead *οικουρούς* ("staying at home" or "domestic"), BDAG, s.v. *οικουργός*. Bruce M. Metzger states the preference for the less common term, "because of superior external support, and because it was regarded more probable that an unusual word should have been altered by copyists to a well-known word, than vice versa" (*Textual Commentary*, 654). See also Quinn, *Letter to Titus*, 121.

⁵³ Quinn notes that the verb *ὑποτάσσειν* is not found in 1 or 2 Timothy, although the noun *ὑποταγή* occurs in 1 Tim 2:11 (*Letter to Titus*, 122).

⁵⁴ "Good works" appears in various formulae throughout the Pastorals (1 Tim 2:10; 3:1b; 5:10, 25; 6:18; 2 Tim 3:17; Titus 3:8, 14).

not talking back, not misappropriating, but demonstrating all good faith, so that they [i.e., the slaves] may adorn the teaching of our savior God in all things.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ. πρεσβύτας νηφαλίους εἶναι, σεμνοὺς, σώφρονας, ὑγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ. πρεσβύτιδας ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς, μὴ διαβόλους μηδὲ οἶνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένους, καλοδιδασκάλους, ἵνα σωφρονίζωσιν τὰς νέας φιλόανδρους εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους, σώφρονας, ἀγνάς, οἰκουργούς, ἀγαθὰς, ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῇται. τοὺς νεωτέρους ὡσαύτως παρακάλει σωφρονεῖν· περὶ πάντα σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον καλῶν ἔργων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν, σεμνότητα, λόγον ὑγιᾶ ἀκατάγνωστον, ἵνα ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐντραπῇ μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον. δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πάσιν, εὐαρέστους εἶναι, μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας, μὴ νοσφιζομένους, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν, ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοσμώσιν ἐν πάσιν.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCE WORKS

- The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Eds. H. Cancik and H. Schneider; English Edn. Managing Ed. Christine F. Salazar. 9 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Eds. H. Cancik and H. Schneider. 16 vols. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1996–2003.
- Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Eds. P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1987–2005.
- Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Rev. H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie. 9th ed. with rev. supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949; 1996.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. New York; London: United Bible Society, 1971.
- The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Eds. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Smyth, H.W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920; rev. 1956.

ANCIENT SOURCES AND TRANSLATIONS

- Aelian. Claudii Aeliani de natura animalium libri xvii, varia historia, epistolae, fragmenta*. Ed. Rudolf Hercher. 2 vols Leipzig: Teubner, 1864 (repr. 1971).
- Aelius Theon. Progymnasmata*. L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1854 (repr. 1966): 59–130.
- The Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus*. With an English translation by Allen Rogers Benner and Francis H. Fobes. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Ed. Abraham J. Malherbe. SBLSPS 19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Anonymus Photii. The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Ed. Holger Thesleff. Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 30/1. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi, 1965: 237–242.
- The Apostolic Fathers*. Trans. K. Lake. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1912–1913.
- Aristotle*. Trans. H.P. Cooke, H. Tredennick, et al. 23 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938–1960.

- . *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. and comm. Terence Irwin. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1985.
- Arius Didymus: *Epitome of Stoic Ethics*. Ed. Arthur J. Pomeroy. Texts and Translations 44; Graeco-Roman 14. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
- The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric. Vol. 1: The Progymnasmata*. Trans. and ed. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil. SBLTT 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.
- The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric. Vol. 2: Classroom Exercises*. Trans. and ed. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil. Writings from the Greco-Roman World. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- [Cicero]. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Trans. H. Caplan. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Clement of Alexandria*. Eds. L. Früchtel, O. Stählin, and U. Treu. 4 vols. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1936–1970.
- The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. Abraham J. Malherbe. Vol. 12. SBL SBS. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Diogenes Laertius. Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. Trans. R.D. Hicks. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Epistolographi Graeci. Recensuit, recognovit, adnotatione critica et indicibus instruxit Rudolphus Hercher*. R. Hercher. Paris: Didot, 1873.
- Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History*. Trans. K. Lake and J.E.L. Oulton. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926–1932.
- Gellius, Aulus. *Attic Nights*. Trans. M. Fant. In *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: a Sourcebook in Translation*. Eds. M. Lefkowitz and M. Fant. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. Contra Julianum imperiatorem*. Migne, PG 35.664–720.
- Hermesianax. *A Stylistic Commentary on Hermesianax*. Ed. P. Kobiliri. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1998.
- Hesiod. *Theogony*. Trans. Hugh G. Evelyn White. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Iamblichus. *De Vita Pythagorica*. In *On the Pythagorean Way of Life: Text, Translation, and Notes*. Ed. John Dillon and Jackson Hershbell. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . *On the Pythagorean Life*. Trans. and intro. Gillian Clark. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.
- Julius Pollux. *Pollucis onomasticon*. Ed. E. Bethe. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900–1937.
- Lucian. Trans. A.M. Harmon. 8 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913 (repr. 1961).
- Mingana, A. *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts, vol. 3: Additional Christian Arabic and Syriac Manuscripts*. Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1939: 95–101.
- "Musonius Rufus: 'The Roman Socrates.'" Ed. and trans. C.E. Lutz. YCS 10 (1947): 1–147.
- New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. 9 vols. Ed. G.H.R. Horsley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–2002.
- Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Rev. and ed. K. Aland, et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1993.

- Orelli, C. *Socratis et Socraticorum, Pythagorae et Pythagoreorum quae ferunter Epistolae*. Leipzig: In libraria Weidmannia, 1815.
- Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Ed. M. Borret. *Sources chrétiennes* vols. 132, 136, 147, 150. Paris: Éditions Cerf, 1967–1969.
- Papyri Graecae Haunienensis*. Ed. and trans. A. Bülow-Jacobsen, Vol. 2: "Letters and mummy labels from Roman Egypt." Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1981.
- Plato. Trans. H.N. Fowler, W.R.M. Lamb, et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–1935.
- Pestman, P.W. *The New Papyrological Primer*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Photius. *Bibliothèque*. Ed. R. Henry. 8 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959–1977.
- Plutarch's "Advice to the Bride and Groom" and "A Consolation to His Wife": *English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography*. Ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Plutarch's *Moralia*. Trans. F.C. Babbitt, W. Helmbold, et al. 15 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–1969.
- Porphyry. Ed. A. Nauck. *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula selecta*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1886; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963.
- Pseudo-Libanius. *Epistulae. Libanii Opera*. Ed. R. Foerster. 12 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.
- . In *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Ed. and trans. Abraham J. Malherbe. SBLSPS 19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Quintilian. Trans. H.E. Butler. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920–1922.
- Sachau, E. *Inedita Syriaca: Über die Reste der syrischen Übersetzungen classischgriechischer, nichtaristotelischer Litteratur unter den nitrischen Handschriften des Britischen Museums*. *Hermes* 4 (1870).
- Select Papyri*. Trans. A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932–1934.
- Semonides. *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women*. Ed. and trans. H. Lloyd-Jones. Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes, 1975.
- Seneca. Trans. E. Phillips Barker. *Seneca's Letters to Lucilius*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1932.
- Soranus. *Gynaeciorum*. Ed. J. Ilberg. 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.
- Städele, Alfons. *Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, vol. 115. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1980.
- Stobaeus, Ioannis. *Anthologium*. Ed. Curtis Wachsmuth and Otto Hense. 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1909.
- Suidae Lexicon*. Ed. Ada Adler. 5 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1938.
- Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem*. Trans. Ernest Evans. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Theodoret. P. Canivet, *Théodoret de Cyr. Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, SC 57. Paris: Cerf, 1977. 1:100–287; 2:296–446.
- Theon of Alexandria. Rhetores graeci*. 3 vols. Ed. Leonhard von Spengel. Leipzig: Teubner, 1884–1886; vol. 1 rev. C. Hammer, 1894.
- . In *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Vol. 1: The Progymnasmata*. Trans. and ed. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil. SBLTT 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.

- Thesleff, Holger. *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 30/1. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi, 1965.
- Thom, Johan C. *The Pythagorean "Golden Verses": With Introduction and Commentary*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World series, 123. Eds. R. van den Broek, H.J.W. Drijvers, and H.S. Vernel. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Wolf, Johann Christian. *Mulierum Graecarum Quae Oratione Prosae Usae Sunt Fragmenta et Elogia Graece et Latina*. Hamburg: Vandenhoeck, 1735.
- Xenophon, "Oeconomicus": A Social and Historical Commentary*. With a new English translation. Sarah B. Pomeroy. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Allen, Danielle. "Burning the Fable of the Bees: The Incendiary Authority of Nature." Pages 74–99 in *The Moral Authority of Nature*. Eds. Lorraine Duston and Fernando Vidal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Allen, Prudence. *The Concept of Woman, Vol. 1: The Aristotelian Revolution, 750 B.C.–A.D. 1250*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Annas, Julia. "Plato's *Republic* and Feminism." Pages 3–12 in *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*. Ed. Julie K. Ward. *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Ascough, Richard W. *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians & 1 Thessalonians*. WUNT II: 161. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Asmis, Elizabeth. "The Stoics on Women." Pages 68–92 in *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*. Ed. Julie K. Ward. *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Aune, David E. *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- . *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2003.
- Bagnall, Roger S. and Raffaella Cribiore, with contributions by Evie Ahtaridis. *Women's Letters from Ancient Egypt, 300 B.C.—(A.D. 800)*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006.
- Balch, David L. *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. SBLMS. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981.
- . "Neopythagorean Moralists and the New Testament Household Codes." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.26.1 (1992): 380–411.
- Balla, Peter. "Evidence for an early Christian Canon (Second and Third Century)." Pages 372–385 in *The Canon Debate*. Eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Barnett, Albert E. *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Bassler, Jouette M. *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Berger, Klaus. "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament." *ANRW*. II.25.2 (1984): 1031–1432.
- Bjelland, Kartzow, Marianne. *Gossip and Gender: Othering of Speech in the Pastoral Epistles*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

- Boatwright, Mary Taliaferro. "Plancia Magna of Perge: Women's Roles and Status in Roman Asia Minor." Pages 249–272 in *Women's History and Ancient History*. Ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Bobbitt, Franklin. *The Curriculum*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1918.
- Borthwick, E. Kerr. "Bee Imagery in Plutarch." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series. 41:2 (1991): 560–562.
- Bradley, Keith. *Discovering the Roman Family: Studies in Roman Social History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- . "Images of Childhood: Evidence of Plutarch." Pages 183–196 in *Plutarch's "Advice to the Bride and Groom" and "A Consolation to His Wife": English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography*. Ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Bremen, Riet van. "Women and Wealth." Pages 223–242 in *Images of Women in Antiquity*. Eds. Averil Cameron and Amelie Kuhrt. Rev. ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993.
- Bruce, F.F. "Some Thoughts on the Beginning of the New Testament Canon." *BJRL* 65 (1983): 37–60.
- Burgess, Theodore C. "Epideictic Literature." *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902): 89–261.
- Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard. "Seneca's Collection of Epistles: A Medium of Philosophical Communication." Pages 88–109 in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz*. Ed. Adela Yarbro Collins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Eds. Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- Clark, Gillian. Review of *A History of Women Philosophers, Vol. 1*. In *The Classical Review*, New Ser., 38: 2 (1988), 429–430.
- . *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Life*, trans. with notes and introduction by Gillian Clark. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.
- Clark, Lorraine M.G. and Lynda Lange. *The Sexism of Social and Political Theory: Women and Reproduction from Plato to Nietzsche*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Collins, Raymond F. *I & II Timothy and Titus: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002.
- Cook, Kathleen C. "Sexual Inequality in Aristotle's Theories of Reproduction and Inheritance." Pages 51–67 in *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*. Ed. Julie K. Ward. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Corley, Kathleen E. *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2002.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "A Woman's Unbound Hair in the Greco-Roman World, with Special Reference to the Story of the 'Sinful Woman' in Luke 7:36–50." *JBL* 124.4 (2005): 675–692.
- Criore, Raffaella. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church." Pages 261–271 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullman zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*. NovTSup 6. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup and David Hellholm. "Garment-Metaphors: the Old and the New Human Being." Pages 139–158 in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy, Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*. Eds. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2001.
- Dalby, Andrew. "Levels of Concealment: The Dress of *Hetairai* and *Pornai* in Greek Texts." Pages 111–124 in *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World*. Ed. Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones. London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2002.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "Εὐσεβεία: Roman Imperial Family Values and the Sexual Politics of 4 Maccabees and the Pastorals." *BibInt* 11, 2 (2003): 139–165.
- Davies, Margaret. *The Pastoral Epistles*. NTG. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Deming, Will. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Derksen, L.D. *Dialogues on Women: Images of Women in the History of Philosophy*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1996.
- Dewey, Joanna. "1 Timothy," "2 Timothy," "Titus." *The Women's Bible Commentary*. Eds. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Trans. P. Böttolp and A. Yarbro. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Mother*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.
- . *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Donelson, Lewis R. *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 22. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.
- Edmondson, J.C. and Alison Keith, eds. *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Elderkin, G.W. "The Bee of Artemis." *The American Journal of Philology* 60:2 (1939): 203–213.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. "Paraenesis Terminology in Philo." Pages 371–392 in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen*. Eds. David E. Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen. NovTSup 106. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon." Pages 485–515 in *The Canon Debate*. Eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Fantham, Elaine. *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- . "Covering the Head at Rome: Ritual and Gender." Pages 158–171 in *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*. Eds. Edmondson, J.C. and Alison Keith. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Fantham, Elaine, H. Peet Foley, N. Boyne Kampen, Sarah B. Pomeroy, and A.H. Shapiro. *Women in the Classical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Finley, M.I. *The Ancient Economy*. Updated ed., with foreword by Ian Morris. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999; orig. publ. 1973.
- Fiore, Benjamin. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. *Analecta biblica* 105. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- . *The Pastoral Epistles: First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus*. *Sacra Pagina* 12. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books (Random House), 1986.
- Freeman, Kathleen. *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Companion to Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gardner, Jane F. *Women in Roman Law and Society*. Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986; repr. 1995.
- Gardner, Jane F. and Thomas Wiedemann. *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*. New York; London: Routledge, 1991.
- Garrison, Elise P. "Suicidal Females in Greek and Roman Mythology: A Catalogue." Διοτίμα, at www.stoa.org/diotima/essays/garrison_catalogue.shtml.
- Geytenbeek, A.C. van. *Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe*. Rev. ed., trans. B.L. Hijmans, Jr. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1962.
- Glancy, Jennifer A. *Slavery in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Gleason, Maud W. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Grosheide, F.W. *Some Early Lists of the Books of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Guthrie, Kenneth Sylvan. *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library: An Anthology of Ancient Writings Which Relate to Pythagoras and Pythagorean Philosophy*. Comp. and trans. Guthrie. Add. trans. Thomas Taylor and Arthur Fairbanks, Jr. Intro. and ed. David R. Fideler. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1987.
- Häfner, Gerd. "Das Corpus Pastorale als literarisches Konstrukt." *TQ* 187, 4 (2007): 258–273.
- Harrison, Percy Neal. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- . *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- . "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." *ExpTim* 67 (1955–1956): 77–81.
- Hawley, Richard. "The Problem of Women Philosophers in Ancient Greece." Pages 70–87 in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Herzer, Jens. "Abschied vom Konsens? Die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe als Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft." *TLZ* 129, 12 (2004): 1267–1282.
- Hope, Richard. *The Book of Diogenes Laertius: Its Spirit and Its Method*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.
- Huizenga, Annette Bourland. "Epitomizing Virtue: Clothing the Christian Woman's

- Body." Pages 261–281 in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Essays on Early Christian Concepts of Personhood*. Eds. Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor Thompson. WUNT 284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012: 261–281.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Jaeger, Werner Wilhelm. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture; Vol. 1, Archaic Greece: the Mind of Athens*. Trans. Gilbert Highet. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed. 1945.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*. NTD. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1934; 1963.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*. The New Testament in Context Series. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- . *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*. AB35A. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Joshel, Sandra R. and Sheila Monahan, eds. *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. London, New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Judge, E.A. "A Woman's Behaviour." In *NewDocs* 6 (1992): 18–23.
- Kahn, Charles H. *Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans: A Brief History*. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 2001.
- Karris, Robert J. "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles." *JBL* 92: 4 (1973): 549–564.
- . "The Function and Sitz-im-Leben of the Paraenetic Elements in the Pastoral Epistles." Ph.D. Diss. Harvard University, 1971.
- Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Trans. with introduction and notes by George A. Kennedy. SBLWGRW, vol. 10. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Kidd, Reggie M. *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A "Bourgeois" Form of Early Christianity?* SBLDS 122. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.
- . With the collaboration of Daniel P. Bailey. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Kotzin, Rhoda Hadassah. "Ancient Greek Philosophy." Pages 9–20 in *A Companion to Feminist Philosophy*. Eds. Alison M. Jaggar and Iris Marion Young. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1998.
- Lake, Kirsopp. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*. 2nd ed. London: Rivingtons, 1919.
- Lambropoulou, Voula. "Some Pythagorean Female Virtues." Pages 122–134 in *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*. Eds. Richard Hawley and Barbara Levick. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Lateiner, Donald. "Blushes and Pallor in Ancient Fictions." *Helios* 25:2 (1998): 163–189.
- Lattimore, Richmond. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, David E. Orton. Eds. David E. Orton & R. Dean Anderson. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- Lefkowitz, Mary R. and Maureen B. Fant. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook in Translation*. 1st ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982; 2nd ed. 1992.
- Lightman, Majorie and William Zwiessel. "Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society." *Church History* 46:1 (1977): 19–32.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd, ed. *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World*. London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2002.
- Lloyd, Genevieve. *The Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Lovén, Lena Larsson. "Lanam fecit: woolworking and female virtue." Pages 85–95 in *Aspects of Women in Antiquity*, Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity. Eds. Lena Larsson Lovén and Agneta Strömberg. Jönsered: P. Åströms Förlag, 1998.
- Lovering, Eugene Harrison. "The Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation of the Corpus Paulinum." Ph.D. Dissertation. Southern Methodist University, 1989.
- . Review of David Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik*. NTOA 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. In *JBL*, 110:4 (1991), 736–738.
- Lovibond, Sabina. "An Ancient Theory of Gender: Plato and the Pythagorean Table." Pages 88–101 in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman*. New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. "Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles." Pages 19–35 in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Christian Fathers*. Ed. W.E. March. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1980. Repr. pages 121–136 in *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- . "In Season and out of Season." *JBL* 103 (1982): 23–41. Repr. pages 235–243 in *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- . *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- . *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. SBLBS 19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- . *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- . *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. AB32B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . "Paraenesis in the Epistle to Titus." Pages 297–317 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Eds. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen. BZNW 125. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- . "The *Virtus Feminarum* in 1 Timothy 2:9–15." Pages 45–65 in *Renewing Tradition: Studies in Texts and Contexts in Honor of James W. Thompson*. Eds. Mark W. Hamilton, Thomas H. Olbricht, Jeffrey Peterson. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick (Wipf and Stock), 2006.
- . "How to Treat Old Men and Women: The Use of Philosophical Traditions and Scripture in 1 Timothy 5." *Scripture and Traditions* 2008: 283–290.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Pastoral Epistles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Martin, Dale B. "Slave Families and Slaves in Families." Pages 207–230 in *Early*

- Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*. Eds. David L. Balch and Carolyn Osiek. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Martin, Seán Charles. "Pauli Testamentum": 2 Timothy and the Last Words of Moses. Tesi gregoriana. Serie Teleologie 18. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997.
- Martinez, David G. "The Papyri and Early Christianity." Pages 590–622 in *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Ed. Roger S. Bagnall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- McDonald, Lee Martin. "Appendix D." Pages 591–597 in *The Canon Debate*. Eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Ménage, Gilles. *The History of Women Philosophers*. Trans. Beatrice H. Zedler. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- Merz, Annette. *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*. NTOA/SUNT 52. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004.
- Meunier, Mario. *Femmes Pythagoriciennes: Fragments et Lettres de Théano, Périclione, Phintys, Mélissa et Myia*. Paris: L'Artisan du Livre, 1932.
- Miller, James D. *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents*. SNTSMS 93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Milnor, Kristina. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus*. Oxford Studies in Classical Literature and Gender Theory. Eds. David Konstan and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. First American Ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.
- . "Reading to Virtue." Pages 110–121 in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz*. Ed. Adela Yarbro Collins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . "PTebt 703 and the Genre of 1 Timothy: The Curious Career of a Ptolemaic Papyrus in Pauline Scholarship." *NovT* 44 (2002): 344–370.
- . "Corrective Composition, Corrective Exegesis: The Teaching on Prayer in 1 Tim 2:1–15." Pages 41–62 in *1 Timothy Reconsidered*. Ed. Karl P. Donfried. Louvain: Peeters, 2008.
- Mott, Stephen Charles. "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10–14 and III 3–7." *NovT* 20:1 (1978): 22–48.
- Moule, C.F.D. "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal." Pages 113–132 in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Mounce, W.D. *The Pastoral Epistles*. WBC 46. Dallas: Word, 2000.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "2 Timothy Contrasted with 1 Timothy and Titus." *RB* 98: 3 (1991): 403–410.
- . *Paul: A Critical Life*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Nagy, Blaise. "The Naming of Athenian Girls: A Case in Point." *CJ* 74 (1979): 360–364.
- Nails, Debra. "The Pythagorean Women Philosophers: Ethics of the Household" Pages 291–297 in *Ionian Philosophy*. Ed. K.J. Boudouris. Athens: International Association for Greek Philosophy, 1989.

- North, Helen F. *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 35. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- . "The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee: *Sophrosyne* as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity." *Illinois Classical Studies*, vol. II. Ed. Miroslav Marcovich. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1977: 35–48.
- Nussbaum, Martha. "The Incomplete Feminism of Musonius Rufus, Platonist, Stoic, and Roman." Pages 283–326 in *The Sleep of Reason*. Eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Økland, Jorunn. *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuatory Space*. JSNTSS 269. London, New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Olson, Kelly. "Matrona and Whore: The Clothing of Women in Roman Antiquity." *Fashion Theory*. 6:4 (2002): 387–420.
- . *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-presentation and Society*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Osiek, Carolyn. "The Widow as Altar: The Rise and Fall of a Symbol." *Second Century* 3: 3 (1983): 159–169.
- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Household and House Churches*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1997.
- Osiek, Carolyn and Margaret Y. MacDonald. *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. With Janet H. Tulloch. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Parkin, Tim G. *Old Age in the Roman World: A Cultural and Social History*. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University press, 2003.
- Pellikaan-Engel, Maja. "Socrates' Blind Spots." Pages 5–11 in *Against Patriarchal Thinking*, Proceedings of the VIth Symposium of the International Association of Women Philosophers (IAPh) 1992. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1992.
- Penny, Donald N. "The Pseudo-Pauline Letters of the First Two Centuries." Ph.D. dissertation. Emory University, 1979.
- Plant, I.M., ed. *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome: An Anthology*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken, 1975, repr. 1995.
- . *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984.
- Popkes, Wiard. "Paraenesis in the New Testament: An Exercise in Conceptuality." Pages 13–46 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Eds. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen. BZNW 125. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Possekkel, Ute. "Der 'Rat der Theano': Eine pythagoreische Spruchsammlung in syrischer Übersetzung." *Le Muséon* 111:1–2 (1998): 7–36.
- Pratt, Louise. "The Old Women of Ancient Greece and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 130 (2000): 41–65.
- Prior, Michael. *Paul the Letter-Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy*. JSNTS 23. Sheffield: JSOT 1989.
- Quinn, Jerome D. *The Letter to Titus*. AB35. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- . "Paraenesis and the Pastoral Epistles: Lexical Observations Bearing on the Nature of the Sub-Genre and Soundings on its Role in Socializations and

- Liturgies." Pages 189–210 in *Paraenesis: Act and Form*. Eds. Leo G. Perdue and John G. Gammie, Semeia 50. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Quinn, Jerome D. and William C. Wacker. ECC. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Reynolds, L.D. and Wilson, N.G. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Riedweg, Christoph. *Pythagoras: His Life, Teaching, and Influence*. Trans. Steven Rendall, in collaboration with Christoph Riedweg and Andreas Schatzmann. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Robbins, Gregory Allen. "Muratorian Fragment." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 4. Ed. D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*. Zurich: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1988.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . *Ancient Greek Literary Letters: Selections in Translation*. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Rothschild, Clare K. "Muratorian Canon As Fraud." Paper presented the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Boston, Mass., November 2008.
- Saller, Richard P. *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994; repr. 1996.
- Scheinberg, Susan. "The Bee Maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83 (1979): 1–28.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983; 2nd ed. 1993.
- Scott, Joan W. "Feminism's History." *Journal of Women's History* 16.2 (2004): 10–29.
- Sebasta, Judith Lynn and Larissa Bonfante, eds. *The World of Roman Costume*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
- Sebasta, Judith Lynn. "Symbolism in the Costume of the Roman Woman." Pages 46–53 in *The World of Roman Costume*. Eds. Judith Lynn Sebasta and Larissa Bonfante. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
- Smith, Craig A. *Timothy's Task, Paul's Prospect: A New Reading of 2 Timothy*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2006.
- Spender, Dale. *The Writing or the Sex?, or, Why You Don't Have to Read Women's Writing to Know it's No Good*. New York: Pergamon, 1989.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Les Épîtres Pastorales*. 4th ed. 2 vols. Paris: Gabalda, 1969.
- Standhartinger, Angela. "Eusebeia in den Pastoralbriefen: Ein Beitrag zum Einfluss römischen Denkens auf das entstehende Christentum." *NovT* 48.1 (2006): 51–82.
- Starr, James and Troels Engberg-Pedersen. *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. BZNW 125. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS 57. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.
- . *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Sundberg, Albert C. "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List." *HTR* 66 (1973): 1–4.
- Taylor, Joan E. *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo's "Therapeutae" Reconsidered*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Taylor, Thomas. *Political Fragments of Archytas, Charondas, Zaleucus, and Other Ancient Pythagoreans, Preserved by Stobæus; and also, Ethical Fragments of Hie-*

- rocles ... Preserved by the Same Author*. Chiswick, Printed by C. Whittingham for the translator, 1822.
- Thesleff, Holger. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora 24/3. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi, 1961.
- . *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 30/1. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi, 1965.
- . "On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica: An Alternative Theory of Date and Purpose." Pages 88–102 in *Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythagorica, Lettres de Platon, Littérature pseudépigraphique juive*. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 18. Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 1972.
- Thom, Johan C. *The Pythagorean "Golden Verses": With Introduction and Commentary*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World series, 123. Eds. R. van den Broek, H.J.W. Drijvers, and H.S. Vernel. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "'The Mind Is Its Own Place': Defining the *Topos*." Pages 555–573 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture, Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Eds. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht and L. Michael White. NovTSup 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "The Passions in Neopythagorean Writings." Pages 67–78 in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. Ed. John T. Fitzgerald. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Thompson, Cynthia L. "Hairstyles, Head-covering, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth." *Biblical Archaeologist*, June 1988: 99–115.
- Thurston, Bonnie Bowman. *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Towner, Philip H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Trobisch, David. *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik*. NTOA 10. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- . *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Trummer, Peter. "Corpus Paulinum—Corpus Pastorale: Zur Ortung der Paulustradition in den Pastoralbriefen." Pages 122–145 in *Paulus in den neutestamentlichen Spatschriften*. Ed. K. Kertelge. QD 89. Freiburg: Herder, 1981.
- Tulloch, Janet H. "Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets." Pages 164–193 in *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Eds. Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Van Neste, Ray. *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*. New York; London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Verner, David C. *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*. SBLDS 71. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Wagener, Ulrike. *Die Ordnung des "Hauses Gottes": Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe*. WUNT 2, vol. 65. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.
- Waithe, Mary Ellen, ed., *A History of Women Philosophers*. 4 vols. Boston: Martin Nijhoff, 1987.
- Ward, Julie K., "Harmonia and Koinonia: Moral Values for Pythagorean Women." Pages 57–68 in *Explorations in Feminist Ethics: Theory and Practice*. Eds. Eve

- Browning Cole and Susan Coultrap-McQuin. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- , ed. *Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Wider, Kathleen. "Women Philosophers in the Ancient Greek World: Donning the Mantle." *Hypatia* 1:1 (1986): 21–62.
- Wilhelm, Friedrich. "Die Oeconomica der Neupythagoreer Bryson, Kallikratidas, Periktione, Phintys." *RhMN.F* 70 (1915): 161–223.
- Winter, Bruce W. *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Wyke, Maria. "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World." Pages 134–151 in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*. Eds. Léonie J. Archer, Susan Fischler, and Maria Wyke. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Young, Frances M. *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. New Testament Theology series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Women Recovering Our Clothes." Pages 176–188 in *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES CITED

ANCIENT GREEK AND LATIN LITERATURE

Aelian		Aristotle	
<i>Letters to Farmers</i>		<i>Generation of Animals</i>	
<i>On the Nature of Animals</i>		in3	
1.58	87n41	<i>Metaphysics</i>	
1.60	89n50	1.986a	5, 295n18
2.43	295n18	<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>	
5.10–11	89n50	1095b	149
5.11.30–38	86–87	1105b	187n63
		1106b–1110a	142n44
Aelius Theon		<i>Politics</i>	
<i>Progymnasmata</i>		1252a	196n92
61	98	1252a–b	71n224, 75n275
62–66	98	1253b	6, 166
110.7	211n33	1254a	75n274
Aeschylus		1255b	196n92
Frag.84	85n37	1259a–b	7
		1259b	7
		1260a	7
Aesop		<i>Rhetoric</i>	
<i>Fables</i>		1.2.3–6	99n89, 152n83
74	95n75	1.2.3–7	296n24
82	95n75	1.2.7	296n25
172	95n75	1.3.3	132n7
177	95n75	3.7.6–7	99.89
		3.9.8	296n26
<i>Anonymous Photii</i>		Aulus Gellius	
237.16	91	<i>Attic Nights</i>	
438b	98	12.1	179n34
<i>Anthologium Palatina</i>		12.10–12	181
7.13	85n35	12.17	181
		12.20	181n38
Antipater of Tarsus		Bryson	
<i>On Marriage</i>		<i>On Household Management</i>	
25–26	192n81	43n56	
47	195n88		
221–229	177n26		
Archytas		Callicratidas	
<i>On Law and Justice</i>		<i>On the Happiness of Households</i>	
	43n56, 190n72	14n48, 44n56	
<i>On Moral Education</i>		Cato	
	43n56, 190n72	<i>De Ag.</i>	
		56–58	196n92

Cicero		Hermesianax	
<i>To Friends</i>		<i>El. Frag.</i>	
5	133n13	7	97-98, 97n80
Charondas		Hesiod	
<i>Prooem.</i>	14n48	<i>Theogony</i>	
		594-602	87n43
Cynic Epistles	121n168	Hierocles	
<i>Ep.</i> 3	120n164	<i>On Marriage</i>	190n75
<i>Ep.</i> 9	348n52	53-20,25	154n88
<i>Ep.</i> 30	11	55	192n81
<i>Ep.</i> 32	11		
Demosthenes		Hippodamus	
<i>Contra Neaera</i>		<i>De rep.</i>	14n48
59.122	68n198		
Dio Chrysostom		Homer	
<i>Or.</i>		<i>Hymn to Hermes</i>	85n34
4.135	150n75	<i>Iliad</i>	
17.2.5	133n11	23.533	72n239
Diogenes Laertius		Horace	
<i>Vitae phil.</i>	103n101, n102	<i>Carm.</i>	
8.42	103, 104n108	3.6.37-41	187n64
8.43	103-104, 114n149	<i>Serm</i>	
8.50	104	1.6.71-92	187n63
9.59	109n124	Hyginus	
Diotogenes		<i>Fables</i>	
<i>De regn.</i>	14n48	243	91n55
76	150n76	Iamblicus	
<i>On Sanctity</i>	44n56, 190n72	<i>De Vita Pythagorica</i>	
76	151n82		122n173
Eccelus		2-10	200n104
<i>De iust.</i>	14n48, 44n56	48	210
		54	200n103
Galen		54-55	104n106
<i>On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body</i>		54-57	14
	1n3	55	105-106
<i>San. Tuenda</i>	179n34	132	98n86, 105-106, 108,
			123n176
Golden Verses		146	105n108, 106-107
32-38	167n144	189-194	109n124
38b	167n144	195	210
		210	210
Gorgias		211	210
<i>Helen</i>	295n18	264-265	107
		265	107n117, 193n84
		267	9, 93, 107-108

Julius Pollux		13	142n46
<i>Onomasticon</i>		15	142n46
10.21	100, 100n92, 114n149	15–16	173
		17	174n20
Juvenal		17–19	175
<i>Satire</i>		19–22	371
6.xi–lxxx	170n6	18	142n46
6.481	198n99	18–19	194
6.398–402	266n25	22	142n46
14	187n63	23–24	175
		24–25	175, 209n30
<i>Letter to Diognetus</i>	134n13	26	175
		26–27	129
Lucian		36–37	174n19
<i>Dialogues of Courtesans</i>			
	78n3	Metopus	
<i>Muscae Encomium (The Fly)</i>		<i>De virt.</i>	185n56, 190n72
	94–95, 95n74		
1	94n70	Musonius Rufus	
2	94n70	<i>Fr.3</i>	10, 21, 124n178,
5	94n70		154n88, 170n3,
6	94n70		175n23, 199, 204n10,
7	94n70		206n15, 350n58,
11	94		358n82
12	94n73	<i>Fr.4</i>	10, 21, 210n32
<i>The Passing of Peregrinus</i>		<i>Fr.12</i>	340n27
12–13	312n66	<i>Fr.13A</i>	154n88, 190n75,
			192n81
<i>Lysis to Hipparchos</i>	36, 36n25, 37n26, 45,	<i>Fr.13B</i>	192n81
	119n161	<i>Fr.14</i>	192n81
<i>Melissa to Kleareta</i>	12, 23, 31, 129–134,	<i>Myia to Phyllis</i>	12, 31, 135–138,
	134n13, 143n51, 169–		177–186, 189n68,
	177, 212, 286n89,		190, 190n71, 212,
	292, 324, 325 (3x),		233, 292, 319, 324,
	332n7, 338n21, 343,		325 (2x), 343, 366
	344, 344n41, 345n44,		(2x), 367n1, 368,
	346, 366 (2x), 367n1,		369
	368, 369 (2x)	2	142n46
2–4	121n168	3	142n46
2–5	50, 122	3–4	135
3	142n46	4	142n46
3–4	173n19, 175	4–6	135
5	142n46	5–6	183n48
6	142n46	12–13	135
7	172n9	14–15	135
7–10	172	15	142n46
8–10	345	17	371
10–11	143n51	22	135n19
11	142n46	26–27	135
12–14	287	27	135n19
12–17	338	28	142n46

- Myia to Phyllis (cont.)*
 29–30 51n83
 30–31 135, 185, 185n53
 31 135n19
 31–35 122
 32 142n46
 33–35 136
- Nicolaus of Damascus
Life of Augustus 187n64
- Ocellus Lucanus
De univ. nat. 14n48, 44n56, 210n32
 45 208n22
 231–237 177n26
- Ovid
Heroides
 II.226–244 91n55
- Pempelus
De parent. 14n48, 44n56
- Periktione
On the Harmony of a Woman (Stob.)
 13, 31, 51n83, 332n7,
 338n21, 344n41,
 345n43
 4.25.50 124n177
 4.28.19 169n3, 171n8, 172n9,
 174n20, 175n23,
 346n48, 347n50 (2x),
 350n58
On Wisdom 31
- Phintys
On the Sophrosyne of a Woman (Stob.)
 13, 23n77, 31, 205–211,
 332n7, 338n21, 344,
 345n43
 4.23.61 206, 207, 211, 338,
 350n58, 375
 4.23.61a 171n8, 172n9, 174n20,
 175n23, 178, 199, 206–
 207, 208, 209, 286,
 347n49, 358, 375n8
- Pindar
Pythian Odes
 IV.60 85n37
- Plato
Apologia
 29d–e 2
Laws
 780d–781b 5n16
 780e–781d 21
 802e 4
 804e–806c 21
 838a–839b 21
Republic
 451c–461e 21
 455d–e 4
 455e–456a 4n12
Timaeus
 42a 4
- Plautus
Most.
 118–121 187n63
- Pliny
Natural History
 11.46 86n40
- Plutarch
Advice to the Bride and Groom
 21, 55, 98–100, 175n23,
 190n75, 210n32,
 332n6, 372n3
 138B 10
 138C 10
 138–146 170n6
 139E–F 171n8
 140B 191
 140C–D 208n23
 140D–E 192n81
 141C–D 171n8
 141D–E 171n8, 174n20, 344
 142A–B 171n8
 142B–C 159n111
 142C 170–171, 171n8
 142C–D 99n87
 142D 266n25, 346n47
 142E 348n53
 143C 346n47
 144B 353
 144C–D 158n108, 191n76
 144D–E 171n8
 144E 344
 145A 124n178, 171n8
 145E 171n8
 145E–146A 348n52

- Alexander*
 330F 150
Antonius
 499C 354n69
Consolation to His Wife
 133n10
 608C–D 189n67
 609D 346n47
 609E 180n36
 610C 160n118, 161
The Education of Children
 1B 178n28
 2E 152n82
 3C 180n35
 3D 181n37
 3E 183n47
 3F–4A 183n47
 5B 151n81
Eroticus
 9 188n65
How to Profit by One's Enemies
 8 266n25
How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend
 49C–D 151n81
 51B 148n70
 52D–F 151n81
 55D 166n142
On Listening to Lectures
 39B 170n5
Virtues of Women
 257E 346n47
- Polemo
Physiognomics
 2.1.198F 324n96
- Porphyry
Cave of the Nymphs
 18.6–7 85n37
 19 86n39
 19.1–5 86
 19.8–10 86
Vita Pythagorae
 4 92, 95n76, 104n108
 18–19 104–105
- Ps.-Apollodorus
Epitome
 617 91n55
- Ps.-Demetrius
On Style 129, 130n4, 292n7
- Eloc.*
 223 129n2
 235 129n2
Ep.
 6 139–140
 11 139
 13n6
- Ps.-Isocrates
Ad Demonicum 133n13
Ad Nicoclem 133n13
- Ps.-Libanius
Epist. 130n4, 131n5, n7
 4 293n13
 5 131–132, 135–136
 34 139
 52 160n16
 79 293n13
 81 139n35
- Ps.-Nicolaus
Progymnasmata
 25.1 111
 25.8 112
- Pythagoras to Hieron* 37, 37n27, 45, 119n161, 190n72
 2–3 (Städele) 125
- Quintilian
Institutio Oratoria 179n34
 10.1.20 47
 10.19 49
- Rhetorica ad Herennium*
 1.10.17 206n17
- Rufus of Ephesus
On Choosing a Wet-Nurse 179n34
- Semonides
Fr. 7 (Women) 88–89, 88n45, n48
 7.3–6 89n49
 7.12–20 170n6
- Seneca
Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium
 46, 119n161, 140n39
 8 47n66
 11 133n13
 13 133n13

<i>Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium (cont.)</i>		2	142n48, 151n79, 343, 368, 369
13.15	133n11		186
94	133n13	2–3	138, 143n53
95	133n13	2–4	147n67
<i>Ira</i>		3	147, 186, 187n62
3.24–25	198n99	3–4	139n33, 186, 371
Socratic Epistles	303n44	4	186, 187
<i>Ep.6</i>	126	4–5	143n54
<i>Ep.27 (Aristippus to Arete)</i>		4–6	146, 147n67, 151n79, 186n59
	134n15, 186n58	5	143n55, 147n67
Soranus		6	142n47
<i>Gynecology</i>	182n42, n43, 182–184	6–7	143
2.5	181	6–10	151n79
2.18.4	179–180	7	147n67, 186n59
12.19.1	182	8	146, 147n67
12.19.13–14	182n44, 183	9	146
12.19.15	183n46, n47	10	187
Stobaeus		11	147n67
<i>Anthologium</i>	55, 55n102, 110–111, 110n127	11–12	146
1.10.13	110	12–13	147
4.23.32	110	12–15	146
4.23.53	111	13–14	146, 147, 186
4.23.55	111	14	147
<i>Suda</i>		15–23	144
Theta 83–85	112	18–21	148
Theta 83–84	114n149	19	142n48, 188n65
Theta 84	92n60, 93	24	142n48
Mu 1361–1363	93, 94n71	24–25	123, 138, 146, 149
Pi 3120	93	25–31	144, 148
Phi 836	91n55	27	186n59
Suetonius		28	370n2
<i>Div. Aug.</i>		32	142n47, 187
73	197n93	33	146
Tacitus		36–37	186
<i>Dialogue</i>	179n34	37	186
28	187n63	37–38	146
28–29	187n64	38	142n47, 370n2
<i>Germania</i>	179n34	38–41	151
Theages		39	186
<i>De virt.</i>	185n56, 190n72	41	142n47
<i>Theano to Euboule</i>	12, 23, 31, 138–153, 186–190, 212, 292, 319, 324, 325, 332n7	41–43	151
		42–43	146
		43	186n59
		<i>Theano to Eurydike</i>	12, 31
		<i>Theano to Kallisto</i>	12, 31, 164–168, 194–200, 212, 292, 324, 325, 368, 369, 389n26
		2	165

2-3	195, 199	40	142n47, 165, 166
2-7	50, 123	42	357n77
3	164n134, 357n77	44-45	164
3-5	164-165		
5-6	165	<i>Theano to Nikostrate</i>	12, 31, 145, 145n60,
5-7	165		153-164, 190-193,
6	165n137, 198		190n71, 210n32, 212,
7	194-195		286n89, 292, 324, 325,
7-8	194		342, 343, 368, 369,
7-11	369		389n26
8	164n134, 357n77	2-5	123
8-9	164	3	142n47, 155n91, n92,
8-11	195		156
9	142n47, 166n140	3-4	156n95
11	195, 357, 357n76	4-5	156n95, 159, 192n78
12	164	5	155n92
12-14	196	5-7	155, 157
12-17	371	6-7	156, 162
12-19	196	7	142n47, 155n91, n92
13-14	164, 194n86, 195	7-11	154
14	164n134	8-9	154n88, 193n82
14-15	143n51, 165	9-10	192n78
14-18	197	10	193
15	357n77	12	142n47, 155n90, n91,
15-16	165		370n2
16-20	369	12-14	160
17	166n140	14-16	161
17-18	166	15	155n90, 370n2
18	165	16	155n92, 193
18-19	196	16-17	153, 156
19	196	17	153, 154n88, 192
20	164n133, n134	17-20	153n85
20-39	196	18-20	192n78
20-44	164	19	155n92
21	165	21-22	158n108
21-22	197n94	23	162
22	357n77	23-24	156n102
24-25	198	26	193
26	165, 195, 357n76	28-29	155n90
26-29	197-198	29	155n90
30	195	30	142n47, 155n91, n92
32	142n47	30-33	192n80
32-35	143n51, 166n141	30-38	163
32-39	164n134	33-34	156n95, 160
33	357n77	34-35	160
35	166	36	142n47, 155n91
35-37	198	38-39	287
36	166	40	155n92
36-37	166	40-41	212n39
37	195, 357	40-42	193n83
37-38	326	40-46	158
38	166	42	155n89, n92

<i>Theano to Nikostrate (cont.)</i>		Virgil	
45	154n88	<i>Georgics</i>	
47	155n88, n92	Book 4	87n43
49	155n92		
49–50	156	Xenophon	
50	155n92	<i>Oeconomicus</i>	7–9, 21n70, 195, 375
50–51	156, 157, 193	3.14–15	8
51–52	157	7.4	89n52
52	155n92	7.6	196n93
52–55	158	7.10	124n178, 171n8, 195,
54–55	326		195n88
56	156, 162, 371	7.10–43	195n89
57	193	7.17	89n51
57–59	159, 192n78	7.21	196n93
59–62	156, 159n113	7.21–25	357n79
61	154n88, 198n96	7.22–23	8
62	142n47, 155n88, n91	7.23	375
62–64	162	7.29–43	357n79
63	162	7.30–31	9
64	162	7.31	9
64–67	161	7.32	89, 90, 90n53
65	155n92	7.33–34	90
		7.34	196n93
<i>Theano to Rhodope</i>	78n5	7.36	196n93
		7.37–38	197n94
Theophrastus		7.38	89n51
<i>Char.</i>		7.41	196n93, 197n94
2	149	7.42	9
		7.43	9
Thucydides		10.2–13	175n23
8.28	65n169	17.14	89n51
		Zaleucas	
		<i>Prooem.</i>	14n48, 44n56

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Mark</i>	
1–3	240, 363	12:40	312
2–3	263, 263n13, 264, 311,	12:42	312
	331, 351, 355	<i>Luke</i>	
3	263	2:36–38	312, 314n73
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		7:36–50	345n41
30:16a	296n23	12:33–34	175n22
17–18	296n23	16:2–4	194n85
19b	296n23	18:1–8	314n73
<i>Proverbs</i>		<i>John</i>	
31:10 (LXX)	1n1	1:3	295n18
<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Acts</i>	
6:19–21	175n22	6:1	312
12:36	282n82	6:1–6	315

6:6	273n47	1:10	243n73
9:39	389n26	3:2	243
9:39–41	312n67	4:8	244
9:41	389n26	4:14–21	275n53
16:1	318, 319n82	4:15	243
16:14–15	318	4:15–17	252
16:40	318	4:16	269n37
18:2	321n86	4:17	232n44, 277n64, 291n2
18:2–3	321n86	5–7	340n27
18:18–19	321n86	5:1–5	243n70
18:24–26	321n86	6:1–6	243n73
<i>Romans</i>		6:10	244
1–2	340n27	6:15–18	243n70, 342n35
1:1	260n8	7	240, 240n64, 241, 313n70, 341n33, 342, 352
1:5	258n3	7:1–16	175n23
2:24	302n43	7:2–5	251
3:8	302n43	7:5	217n2, 341n33
3:28	244	7:7–8	251, 274n52, 342
5:1–5	339	7:8	352n63
5:12–21	240	7:8–9	312, 352n61
7:1–3	342n35	7:10–11	352
7:11	243n73	7:10–16	251
8:15	243	7:11	352n63
8:29	348n54	7:12–16	352n62
9:1	233n47	7:14	341, 352n62
9:21	340n27	7:14–16	217n2
9:22	340n27	7:16	352n62
9:23	244, 340n27	7:25–27	352n63
10:1–2	233n47	7:25–28	251
10:9	244	7:25–40	175n23
10:12	244	7:32–35	274n52, 340–341, 352n63
11:12	244	7:34	244n77, 341, 341n32
11:13	258n3, 260n8	7:34a	341n31
12:1	233n47, 243n73	7:34–35	340
12:1–8	242	7:38	274n52, 342n36
12:3	330	7:38a	251
12:18	233n47	7:38b	251
13:1–7	233n47	7:39	251
13:14	348n54	7:39–40	312, 342n36, 352n69
14:10	243n73	7:40	251, 274n52
14:16	302n43	8:1b	295n18
15:15–18	258n3	8:9	244
15:25–28	244	9:5	274n52
16:1	308	9:11	244
16:1–2	243, 244, 318	9:17	194n85
16:3	244	10:1	243n73
16:3–5a	321n86	10:23–30	245
16:3–5	243	10:30	302n43
16:7	243, 244		
<i>1 Corinthians</i>			
1:1	260n8		
1:5	244		

1 Corinthians (cont.)

11:1	269n37
11:3a-c	375
11:3-16	171n8, 242, 245n80, 246
11:4-7	245n79
11:8	375
11:13-14	245n79
12:1	243n73
12:4-13	242
12:28-30	242
13:13	331
14	242
14:20-25	245
14:33b-35	372
14:33b-36	264n19
14:33b-37	243
14:34	263n13, 280n74, 348n53
14:34b	280n71, 281n78
14:34-35	171n7, 242, 246, 246n83, 264n19 (2x)
14:35	281
14:35a	124n178
14:35-36	264n19
15:1	243n73
15:9	260n8
15:42-49	348n54
16:1-4	244
16:10-11	232n44
16:19	243, 321n86 (2x)
16:20	243n73

2 Corinthians

1:1	232n44, 252n103, 260n8
1:19	232n44, 252n103
2:13	232n44
3:6	295n18
4:7	340n27
5:13	330
7:6-7	232n44
8	244
8:6	232n44
8:13-15	244
8:16-24	244
8:23	232n44
9	244
10-13	239n61
11:2	240
11:2-3	243, 263, 264n17
11:3	263n14

11:23-28

274n52

12:18

232n44

Galatians

1:1

260n8

2:7-9

258n3

2:11-14

239n61

2:16

244

3:27

348n54

3:27-28

348n55

3:28

246n81

4:6

243

4:21-31

243

5:23

330n2

Ephesians

1:1

260n8

1:10

194n85

2:19

243n72

3:2

194n85

3:9

194n85

4:7-12

242

4:22

348n54

4:24

348n54

5:1

269n37

5:21-22

348n53

5:21-33

241n67

5:22

175n23, 217n2, 241n65

5:23-33

241n66

5:25-33

335n14

5:32

243

6:9

336n16

6:10-17

348n55

Philippians

1:1

252n103

1:7

269n39

2:19-24

252n103

2:22

277n64

3:1

133n11

3:17

269n37

3:21

348n54

4:2

239n61

4:2-3

242, 243, 318

4:5-6

245

4:19

244

Colossians

1:1

252n103, 260n8

3

241n66

3:9

348n54

3:18

175n23, 348n53

3:19

335n14

4:1

336n16

4:14

239n61

4:15

243n70

1 Thessalonians

1:1 252n103
 1:3 331n4, 339
 1:6a 269n37
 1:6-7 269n39
 1:7 270n43
 2:1 243n73
 2:7-8 243
 2:9 243n73
 2:11 243
 2:14 269n37
 2:14-16 269n39
 2:17 243n73
 3:1-6 252n103
 3:7 243n73
 3:13 340n28
 4:1 243n73
 4:1-2 133n11
 4:3-7 341
 4:3-8 240n64
 4:4 240n64
 4:9 243n73
 4:10 243n73
 4:11-12 245
 4:13 243n73
 5:1 243n73
 5:8 331n4, 339, 348n55
 5:12 243n73
 5:12-13 242
 5:14 243n73
 5:25 243n73
 5:26 243n73
 5:27 243n73, 253

2 Thessalonians

1:1 252n103
 2:8 299n36
 3:6 133n11
 3:7 269n37
 3:9 269n37

1 Timothy

1:1 260n8, 268n33
 1:2 235n52, 277n64,
 320n84, 335n14, 371
 1:3 228n24, 231n41, 261,
 275n55, 291, 299
 1:3-4 297
 1:3-7 343n38
 1:3-20 267n31
 1:4 194n85, 228n24,
 238n60, 240, 349,
 387n13
 1:4-5 298

1:4-7 288
 1:5 297
 1:6 228n24 (2x), 238n60,
 299
 1:6-7 239, 293, 298 (2x),
 298n32
 1:7b 238n60, 299
 1:9 384
 1:9-10 343n38
 1:10 228n24, 260n7, 323,
 391n40
 1:12-16 268n35
 1:13 302n43
 1:15 235n52, 299n36
 1:15-17 235n52
 1:16 270, 299n36
 1:18 235n52, 260, 275n55,
 275n56, 277n64
 1:18a 261n10
 1:18-20 343n38
 1:19-20 260, 260n9, 293n12
 1:20 235n52, 239n61,
 259n6 (3x), 302n43
 2 348, 355
 2:1 235, 304n46
 2:1-2 270
 2:1-8 233, 280n74
 2:1-15 303n44
 2:2 280n74
 2:2b 335n11
 2:4 299n36
 2:5-6 235n52
 2:7 219, 250n93, 260 (2x),
 275, 288 (2x), 307, 369
 2:8 235, 271, 274n51, 307
 2:8-12 315
 2:8-15 254
 2:8-3:1a 18, 24, 219, 232-233,
 384-385
 2:9 21, 24, 219, 235, 245,
 306 (2x), 330, 330n2
 (3x), 331, 337 (3x),
 338n21, 357, 391n46
 2:9-10 171n8, 263n14, 266,
 274n51, 344, 347, 348,
 358, 360, 362
 2:9-15 19, 23, 175n23, 204,
 205n11, 241n66,
 330n2, 351 (2x)
 2:9-3:1a 24, 249n89, 271, 331,
 334, 360
 2:10 362, 392n54

1 *Timothy* (cont.)

2:10-11	345	3:4-7	316
2:11	171n7, 266, 275n54, 279n69, 281, 281n78, 282, 294, 305n50, 348n53, 349, 384n1, 392n53	3:5	222, 292n8, n9
		3:6a	315
		3:6-7	267, 301n41
		3:7	245, 270n40, 302
		3:7b	299n33
		3:8	267, 307 (2x), 357n77, 372n3, 391n46
2:11-12	161n120, 170n5, 235, 246n83, 264n19, 266n24, 279, 280, 283 (2x), 283n85, 284, 293, 360, 368, 371, 372	3:8-9	308
		3:8-10	308
		3:8-13	315, 386
		3:11	175n23, 219, 241n65, 244n75, 266, 302n43, 303n44, 306, 308- 309, 311n63, 336, 350n57, 356n74, 372n3, 391n46
2:11-13a	243		241n65, 243 (2x), 292n8, 306, 307, 308, 312n65, 316, 319, 325 (3x), 335n15, 337, 353, 357
2:11-15	217n2, 219, 311	3:12	308 (2x), 315, 357n77
2:12	219, 263, 264n18, 265n20, 294, 362, 370		335
2:12b	294		235n52, 260, 275n55
2:13	219, 263 (2x)		243, 336n16
2:13-14	240, 259n6 (2x), 285, 300n37, 325, 359, 363		325, 336n16
			235n52
2:14	19, 263 (2x), 263n14, 264n17, 305n50, 351	3:12-13	218n6, 299n36, 391n40
		3:13	297n29, 298n32
2:15	19, 21, 217n2, 243, 244 (2x), 251, 300, 300n38, 306, 312, 319, 320, 330, 330n2, 331, 335, 337, 339, 342, 352, 355, 356, 359, 361, 362, 372 (2x)	3:14	288, 316, 323, 343n38
		3:14-15	219n8, 238n60, 239n60, 241, 325, 343
		3:15	386
		3:16	251, 335n13, 343n38
		4:1	352
2:15a	355, 363		372
2:15b	355, 363	4:1b	352, 363
3	333	4:1-3	260n7, 269n39, 386n7, 391n40
3:1	235n52	4:1-5	261
3:1a	300n38, 384n3		22, 240, 297n29, 323, 360
3:1b	264n18, 300n40, 335n12, 349, 392n54	4:1-7	323
		4:3	276, 320
3:1b-5	336, 350	4:3a	276n59, 299n36
3:1b-10	315	4:3-4	235n52
3:1b-13	18, 385	4:3-5	261
3:2	21, 241n65, 262, 267, 307 (2x), 325, 330, 330n2 (2x), 334, 335, 337, 353	4:4	277
		4:6	235n52
3:2-4	332	4:6a	261
3:2-5	355n71	4:7	22, 240, 297n29, 323, 360
3:2-7	306		323
3:3	267, 372n3	4:7a	276, 320
3:4	281n76, 307, 312n65, 319, 335n11, n15, 384n1	4:7b	276n59, 299n36
		4:8	235n52
3:4-5	243 (2x), 309n56, 325 (2x), 357	4:9	261
		4:11	277
		4:11-12a	235n52
		4:11-16	

4:12	270n42, 275n55, 277n65	5:11-15	316, 343, 350
4:13	253, 391n40	5:12	363, 372
4:14	272n47	5:13	102, 275n54, 279, 279n69, 280n71, 282 (2x), 283 (2x), 283n85, n86, 284, 298, 304n48, 332n6, 356, 368, 390n36
4:15	18, 275n55		
4:16	261, 275n55 (2x), 300, 391n40		
5	305, 314, 323		
5:1	293n13		
5:1-2	18, 243 (2x), 254 (2x), 261, 277, 277n65, 337, 356, 361, 386, 387	5:13b	299
		5:13b-c	267
		5:13-15	313n70
5:1-16	22	5:14	19, 219, 235, 241, 244, 251, 270n40, 274, 288, 294n16, 302, 307, 312n65, 319, 320, 325 (3x), 326, 335, 336, 352, 355, 356, 360 (2x), 362, 363, 389n26
5:2	288, 294, 339n26, 356, 359, 360, 391n45, 392n49	5:14-15	302n43
5:2b	271	5:15	228n24, 240n62, 251, 272, 298, 298n32, 372
5:3	313, 313n70, 314n72	5:16	219, 235, 303n44, 307, 312n67, 313n70, 317 (2x), 317n78, 326, 326n99, 357, 362, 388n20
5:3-8	243, 244n75, 312		
5:3-10	326		
5:3-16	274, 313, 336, 350n57, 359, 387-389	5:17	254, 262, 316, 349, 391n40
5:4	275n54, 278, 279n69, 307, 313n70, 317, 325, 326n99, 356, 359, 360	5:17-18	313
5:5	274n51, 307, 313n70, 314, 325, 363	5:17-19	243
5:5-6	349	5:19	254
5:5-8	303n44	5:20	261, 292n9, 293n13, 370n2
5:6	219, 245, 292n9, 315, 343, 357, 362, 372	5:21	261n10
5:6-8	313n70	5:22	272n47
5:7	306, 359, 360	5:23	267, 275n55, 276
5:8	292n8, n9, 307, 317, 325	5:25	392n54
5:9	19, 306, 313n70, 325, 326n99, 351, 352, 352n59, 389n26	6:1	270n40, 301n41, 302n42, 302n43, 357 (2x), 357n77
5:9-10	219, 243 (2x), 315, 317n78, 351, 355, 358, 362	6:1-2	336n16, 357 (2x)
5:9-15	251n94, 254, 313	6:1-5	233
5:10	307 (2x), 312n65, 313n70, 316, 319, 320, 325, 335, 338n23, 345n45, 356, 359, 362, 392n54	6:2e	261
		6:3	228n24, 299, 323
		6:3-5	343n38
		6:3-10	239n60
5:10b	294n16	6:4	228n24, 302n43
5:11	272, 313n70, 345n45, 389n26	6:4-5	297n29
		6:5-6	349
5:11-12	219	6:5-10	219
5:11-13	19, 292n9	6:9-10	245

<i>1 Timothy (cont.)</i>		2:2b-c	252
6:10	307, 338n22, 358n81	2:3	269n39 (2x)
6:10b	298n32	2:3-6	273, 320
6:11	275n55, 275n56	2:7	277
6:11b	339n24	2:8	292
6:12	320	2:10	299n36
6:13	275n55	2:11	235n52, 288
6:14	260, 275n55, 299n36	2:11-12	262
6:17	245, 292n9	2:11-13	235n52
6:17-18	219	2:14	261, 343n38
6:17-19	175n22, 235, 303n44, 349, 357	2:15	275n55, 298n32
6:18	244, 392n54	2:16	297n29
6:18-19	299n36	2:16b-17	297n29
6:20	228n24, 238n60, 262, 275n56	2:16-18	343n38
		2:17	239n61, 259n6 (3x)
		2:20	340n27
<i>2 Timothy</i>		2:21	340n27, 357
1:1	260n8, 268n33	2:22	277n65
1:2	235n52, 320n84	2:22-24	243
1:3	275n55	2:23	228n24
1:3-4	235n52, 268n35	2:23-26	343n38
1:3-18	267n31	2:24	307, 357n77
1:4	275n55, 320	2:24-25a	261
1:5	19, 219, 243, 259n6, 274, 275n55, 277n65, 294n16, 318, 318n79, n80, 319n82, 325, 356 (2x), 360 (2x), 363, 389	2:24-25	307
		2:24-26	276n57
		2:25	333
		2:26	267, 299n33
1:6	242n68, 272n47, 275n55, 291, 292n8	3	240n62
1:7	306, 330, 330n2, 371	3:1	299n36
1:8	268n35, 269n39, 274n52, 291n4, 320, 330n2	3:1b	304
1:8-12	269n38	3:1-6	239
1:9	299n36 (2x)	3:1-7	288
1:11	260, 275, 307, 369	3:1-4:5	297n27
1:11-12	274n52	3:1-4:8	267n31
1:12	252, 299n36	3:2	302n43, 307, 325, 335n15, 338n22
1:13	260, 270n41, 323	3:2-3	267, 302n43
1:13-14	242n68	3:2-5a	304
1:14	252	3:3	298, 308n54
1:15	239n61, 259n6 (3x), 293	3:4	338n22
1:15-18	268n35	3:5b	297n27
1:16	235n52, 259n6, 274n52, 357	3:5-6	272
1:18	275n55, 299n36	3:5-7	372
2:1	18, 235, 275n55, 275n56	3:6	240, 325, 343n38, 356n74
2:2	239, 242n69, 262 (2x), 277n64, 293, 371	3:6-7	18, 19, 218, 219, 279, 279n69, 282, 283 (3x), 284, 292n9, 304, 305, 316, 323, 325, 343n38, 360n84, 363, 368, 388n24, 390
		3:6-9	235n52

3:7	275n54, 279n69, 282	<i>Titus</i>	
3:8	259n6 (3x)	1:1	260n8, 268n32,
3:10	260, 260n7, 275n55		357n77
3:10-11	268n35	1:1-3	268
3:10-12	269	1:1-4	250
3:10-14	268n35	1:2	299n36, 320n84
3:10-17	242n68	1:4	235n52, 259n6,
3:11	235n52, 274n52		277n64, 335n14
3:11-14	271n44	1:5	231n41, 260, 275n55,
3:13	343n38		292
3:14	260, 275n54, 275n55,	1:5-6	243, 390
	279n69	1:5-9	18, 262, 350
3:14-15	276, 297n27	1:6	241n65, 245, 281n76,
3:15	275n55, 277n65		306, 309n56, 316, 319,
3:16	370n2		325 (2x), 335, 353
3:17	392n54	1:6b	335n15
4:1	260, 261n10, 299n36	1:7	235, 267, 306, 307
	(2x)		(2x), 333, 338, 372n3
4:1a-2	261	1:7-8	333
4:2	242n69, 293n13 (2x)	1:8	21, 306, 307, 330,
4:2b	293n13		330n2 (2x), 334,
4:3	235n52, 272, 323,		338n22
	391n40	1:9	254, 260n7, 262, 323,
4:3-4	273n48, 343n38		370n2
4:4	228n24, 240, 298n32,	1:10	293n13, 335n15
	343n38, 387n13	1:10-11	239, 273, 316
4:5	242n69, 267, 272,	1:10-14	343n38
	275n55	1:10-16	292n9
4:6	235n52	1:11	325
4:6-7	274n52	1:11-15	225n11
4:6-8	269n38	1:12	262, 278n67
4:6-18	268n35	1:13	277, 293n13, 370n2
4:8	299n36 (3x)	1:13b	260
4:9	239n61	1:14	240, 262, 387n13
4:9-11	235n52	2	251, 265, 323, 334
4:10	259n6 (5x)	2:1	235n52, 260, 265,
4:10a	299n32		272, 275n55, 277,
4:11	259n6		280n71, 323, 333n10,
4:13	261		334, 391n40
4:14	239n61, 259n6 (2x)	2:1-8	18
4:15	275n55	2:1-10	391
4:16	235n52, 299n32	2:1-15	271
4:16-17	274n52	2:2	21, 267, 272, 306 (2x),
4:18	299n35, 299n36		330, 330n2 (3x), 333,
4:19	259n6, 320, 359, 390		333n10, 334, 339
4:19a	357	2:2-6	303n44
4:20	259n6 (2x)	2:2-8	254 (2x)
4:21	251n97, 259n6 (3x),	2:2-10	235, 303
	275n55	2:3	147n66, 265, 265n20,
4:21b	320		272, 294, 302n43, 307,
4:22	275n55	2:3-4a	308n54, 310, 372n3
			331n5

<i>Titus (cont.)</i>			280n71, 293n13 (2x), 323, 370n2
2:3-4	265n20, 273n50		260
2:3-5	22, 175n23, 219, 241n66, 243, 250, 251 (2x), 264, 265n20 (3x), 274, 278, 279, 283, 284 (2x), 288, 294, 310n62, 321, 331, 332, 332n5, 334, 343, 350, 356, 361, 376	2:15ab 3:1 3:1-2 3:2 3:3 3:4 3:5 3:6 3:6-7 3:7 3:8 3:8b 3:9 3:9-11 3:10b 3:10-11 3:12 3:13 3:14 3:15	292 235, 278, 303n44 245, 302n43, 307 (2x) 343n38 338n22 299n36 (2x) 244 293 299n36 235n52, 275n55, 392n54 260 228n24 343n38 260 292n9, 293 251n97, 259n6, 275n55 259n6 (2x) 278, 282n82, 392n54 275n55 235n53, 252n101 252n103 226n14, 243 243 239n61
2:3-8	225n11		
2:4	21, 241n65, 294n16, 306, 312n65, 319, 320, 325, 330, 330n2, 334, 335n14, 338, 351, 352, 360, 370, 376n12		
2:4b-5	332, 336		
2:4-5	19, 241, 244 (2x), 272, 274, 279 (2x), 301n41, 302, 325, 330n2, 354, 355, 357, 359, 363		
2:5	21, 219, 245, 281, 288 (2x), 294n16, 302n43, 305n50, 306, 307, 325, 330, 330n2 (2x), 332n7, 336, 348n53, 350n58, 360, 362, 371, 372, 384n1	<i>Philemon</i> 1 2 10 24	
2:6	21, 260, 330, 330n2 (3x), 391n46	<i>Hebrews</i> 9:21 13:4	
2:6-7	272		340n27 376n10
2:6-8	243, 264n18, 272, 333	<i>James</i>	
2:7	219, 260, 270, 391n40	1:27 2:20	312 282n82
2:8	245, 301n41, 334	<i>1 Peter</i>	
2:9	281n77, 303n44, 357, 357n77	2:14 3 3:1-6 3:3-4 3:3-6	301n41 241n66, 345n42, 348 175n23, 241n66, 347 345n42, 348 171n8
2:9-10	272, 302n42, 336n16, 357	<i>2 Peter</i> 1:8	227n21 282n82
2:10	219, 288 (2x), 301n41	<i>1 John</i> 2:21	295n18
2:11	299	<i>2 John</i>	227n21
2:11-12a	284	<i>3 John</i>	227n21
2:11-12	275, 330, 363	<i>Jude</i>	227n21
2:11-13	235n52	<i>Revelation</i>	227n21
2:11-14	272		
2:12	306, 330n2		
2:13	299n36		
2:14	307		
2:15	235n52, 243, 272,		

ANCIENT JEWISH LITERATURE

Josephus			Philo		
<i>Ant.</i>			<i>De Vita Contemplativa</i>		
6.151	295n18			44n57, 117n156	
3 <i>Maccabees</i> (LXX)			66	347n149	
5:45	266		<i>Praem.</i>		
4 <i>Maccabees</i> (LXX)			139	392n50	
9:25	266		<i>Somn.</i>		
11:20	266		217	172n9	
			<i>Spec.</i>		
			3.171	170n6	

OTHER EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

<i>Acts of Paul and Thecla</i>			4.8	221n2, 271n44	
27, 268n36, 271n44,			4.8.1	109n124	
275			4.8.58–59	374–375	
7–20	221n2		4.8.59–60	375	
			4.8.60	102n97	
Ambrose			4.8.62	102n97	
<i>De viduis</i>			4.19	221n2, 374	
7.40	204n6		4.19.118	101–103, 101n97	
			4.19.121	92, 92n58, 102,	
				102n98	
Amphilochius			4.19.121–122	348n52	
<i>Iambi ad Seleucum</i>			4.19.122	92n58	
	227		4.19.123	374	
Athanasius			4.20	221n2	
<i>Festal Letters</i>			4.20.126	374n4	
39	227		4.20.127–128	376	
			4.20.129	376n10	
Augustine			4.44.2	96n79	
<i>De doctrina christiana</i>					
2.8–9	227		3 <i>Corinthians</i>	250n90	
2.12–14	227				
4.16	229n28		Eusebius		
			<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>		
1 <i>Clement</i>			10.14.9	109n120	
1	246n84		10.14.14	109	
1.3	357n80				
1–2	221n2		Euthalius Diaconus		
21	221n2, 246n24		<i>Epp. Paul.</i>	65n174	
Clement of Alexandria			<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>		
<i>Paidagogus</i>			5	221n2	
2.114.2	102n99		114	221n2	
<i>Stromateis</i>					
1.16.80	100–101, 114n149		Gregory of Nazianzus		
2.20.118	150n75		<i>Contra Julianum imperiatorem</i>		
4.7.44	101n95, n96, 114n149		592	109	

- Hermas
Vision
 2 221n2
 2.4.3 312n66
 4 221n2
Mandate
 4.1 221n2
- Ignatius
To the Magnesians
 11 228n24
To Polycarp
 3.1 228n24
 4 221n2
 5.1–2 353n65
To the Philadelphians
 1.1 228n24
 4–5 221n2
To the Smyrnaeans
 7.1 228n24
 13.1 312n66
- Irenaeus
Adversus haeresus
 1.13 221n2
- John Chrysostom
Homily on 1 Timothy
 9.1 356n73
- Justin
Apologia
 1.27 312n66
 1.67 253n106
 2.2 221n2
- Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas*
 221n2
- Muratorian Fragment* 226n14, 227, 227n22,
 228n22, 250, 252
- Origen
Contra. Celsus
 2.55 360n85
 2.59 360n85
 3.55 304–305n49, 360n85
- Polycarp
Philippians
 4 221n2
 4.1 228n25
- Synod of Laodicea 228
- Syrian Catalog of St. Catherine
 227
- Tertullian
Ad martyras
 4.7 109n124
Adversus Marcionem
 5.21 229
On Monogamy 221n2
- Theodoret
De Caritate
 2.23 110
 12.73 98n86, 110

INSCRIPTIONS, PAPYRI, AND OTHER MANUSCRIPTS

- B.G.U.*
 1050 175n20
 1103 175n20
 1107 179n33, 183n44
- Codex Vaticanus* 225, 226n12
- Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
 VI. 19128 180n36
- Claromontanus (Do6)* 226n13
- Codex Bezae (D)* 225
- Codex Ephraemi (C)* 225
- Codex Sinaiticus* 225
- Liber Syriacus*
 331 113n143
- Or. Add. (Syraic)*
 14.614 113n142
 14.658 113–114, 113n142

P.Elephantine

1 175n20

P.Hauniensis

II.13 38-41, 57, 59n107,
n108, 60n115, n120,
n122, 61n124, n125,
n126, n127, n128,
n129, 84n31, 96, 233,
366

P.Lips.

27 175n20

P.London

3.951 179n33

P.Michigan

3.202 179n33
6551 175n20

P.Oxyrhynchus

1.37 179n33
91 179n33, 183n48
266 175n20
1273 175n20

P.Rylands

154 175n20

P.Tebtunis

703 237n57, 291n2

Papyrus

32 225n11
46 222n3, 225n12, 226n12
61 225n11

Vaticanus Graecus

578 42, 45n59, 99n88

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Allen, D., 87n43, 89n50
 Allen, P., 3n10, 15n50, 83n28, 112n141
 Annas, J., 4, 5n16
 Ascough, R.S., 240n64, 340n29
 Asmis, E., 10n34
 Aune, D.E., 46n61, 50n81, 119n162, 120, 130n4,
 132n7, 133n11, n13, 137n24, 140n36, n37,
 223n5, 295n18
- Bagnall, R., 39n32, 179n33, 180n34
 Balch, D.L., 6n20, 13n44, n45, 14n47, n48,
 19n62, 21n70, 22, 22n75, 41n45, 43n56,
 68n198, 80n17, 177n26, 265n20, 301n41,
 345n42
 Balla, P., 228n22
 Barnett, A.E., 217n2, 247n86
 Bassler, J.M., 21n70, 22n75, 80n17, 223n5,
 242n68, 266n25, 300n37, 308n53, 314n72,
 318n79, 332n6, 385n5, 391n47
 Baur, F.C., 222n4
 Bentley, R., 79, 80
 Berger, K., 241n66
 Bernstein, N.W., 181n39
 Bjelland Kartzow, M., 170n6, 308n53, n54,
 346n46
 Boatwright, M.T., 362n86
 Bobbitt, F., 25, 26
 Bradley, K., 179n32, 188n65, 189n67
 Bruce, F.F., 230n34
 Bülow-Jacobsen, A., 38n31, n32, 39–40,
 40n42, 42n51, 59n107, n114, 60n115, n122,
 61n125, n126, n128, 64n159
 Burgess, T.C., 211n33
 Burkert, W., 41, 41n45
- Cancik-Lindemaier, H., 46, 46n63, n64,
 47n66, 119, 119n163, 121n170, 141n39
 Castelli, E.A., 160n16, 268n31
 Clark, G., 82n26, 200n104
 Clark, L.M.G., 3n10
 Collins, R.F., 18n59, 21n70, 22n75
 Conzelmann, H., 21n70, 22n75, 223n5,
 224n7, 234n51, 238n60, 266n21, n23,
 321n87, 330n2, 338n22, 387n16, 391n47,
 392n48
 Cook, K.C., 6n19
- Corley, K.E., 21, 241n67
 Cosgrove, C.H., 345n41
 Cribiore, R., 26, 38n31, 39n32, 53n94, 55n99,
 n101, 179n33, 180n34
- Dahl, N.A., 230n34, 348n54
 Dalby, A., 68n198, 174n20
 D'Angelo, M.R., 317n77
 Deming, W., 14n47, 177, 177n26, n27, 191n75,
 192n81, 204n9, 208n22, 341
 Derkson, L.D., 1, 1n4, 2, 3n10, 6n19
 Dewey, J., 20, 319n82
 Dibelius, M., 21n70, 22n75, 223n5, 224n7,
 234n51, 238n60, 266n21, n23, 321n87,
 330n2, 338n22, 387n16, 391n47, 392n48
 Dik, H., 84n30, 91n55
 Dixon, S., 124n177, 177n26, 181n39, 187,
 187n64, 188, 188n66, 314n72, 315n74,
 319n83, 322, 322n93, 353n65
 Donelson, L.R., 18n59, 21n71, 83n27, 117,
 117n158, 118n159, n160, 125, 125n181,
 n182, 126n185, 222n4, 223n5, 223n6,
 236n54, n55, n56, 258n2, 259n4, n5,
 267n31, 270n41, 289n1, 295n21, 318–319,
 321n87
- Elderkin, G.W., 85n36, n37, 86n39
 Engberg-Pedersen, T., 279, 293n13, 294,
 294n14
 Epp, E.J., 226n12, 227n16
- Fant, M.B., 15n50, 80n17, 175n20, 179n33,
 180n36, 181n39
 Fantham, E., 23n76, 47n67, 52, 52n86, n89,
 n90, 53n91, n92, 301n41, 345n41
 Finley, M.L., 357n78
 Fiore, B., 17n59, 18n59, 21n70, n71, 22n75,
 120n164, 125n180, 126, 133n13, 134, 134n14,
 223n5, 236, 237n58, 239n60, 247n86,
 251n100, 257, 267n30, n31, 291n2, 295,
 295n22, 303, 303n44, 309, 309n58, 310n59,
 n62, 318n79
 Fitzgerald, J.T., 73n248, n251
 Foucault, M., 190n75
 Freeman, K., 36n25
 Friend, W.H.C., 91n57

- Gamble, H.W., 227, 231, 253, 253n105
 Gardner, J.F., 177n26, 179n30, 353n65
 Garrison, E.P., 91n55
 Gilligan, C., 1n4
 Glancy, J.A., 183n48, 184n50, 340n27
 Gleason, M., 151n80, 324n96
 Goodspeed, E.J., 217n2, 230n34, 247n86, 248, 248n88
 Grosheide, F.W., 226n14, 227n19
 Guthrie, K.S., 14n47
- Häfner, G., 240n62, 247n85, 251, 251n95
 Harper, V.L., 15n50, 51n83, 54n98, 57, 57m103, n104, 58, 58n105, 62n131, n135, 64n157, 65n166, 67n195, 69n209, 81n21, 97n79, 112n141
 Harrison, P.N., 230n34, 234n51, 235n51
 Hawley, R., 17n57, 44n57, 83n28, 97, 101, 108n119, 116
 Hellholm, D., 348n54
 Hercher, R., 37, 58, 60n122, 61n128, 62n138, 63n142, n148, 65n167, 66n175, n177, n183, 69n204, n209, 70n213, n215, 71n227, 73n257, 74n261, n266, n268, 75n273
 Herzer, J., 223n4, 250n91
 Hock, R.F., 54n95, 98n83, 111n134, 112, 348
 Hope, R., 103m102
 Huizenga, A.B., 38n30, 345n41
 Hurtado, L.W., 225n11
- Jaeger, W.W., 26n89
 Jeremias, J., 234n50, 236n55
 Johnson, L.T., 19n62, n63, 20, 20n64, n65, 21n70, 22n75, 222n4, 223n6, 224n6, 229n33, 235n51, 236n55, 237n57, 238n59, 239n60, 242n68, 247n86, 249n90, 250n91, 251n100, 265n20, 278n67, 291n2, 391n47, 392n48
 Joshel, S.R., 194n86
 Judge, E.A., 39n38, 52n88, 54n98, 57n104
- Kahn, C.H., 43n54, 103n101
 Karris, R.J., 18n59, 218n7, 238n60, 292n10, 298n30, 363n87
 Kidd, R.M., 245n78, 358n81
 Klauck, H.-J., 116n155, 120n165, 129n2, 152n83, 223n5, 229n31
 Kobiliri, P., 97n80
 Kotzin, R.H., 3m10
- Lake, K., 230n34
 Lambropoulou, V., 23n77
- Lange, L., 3nn10, 11
 Lateiner, D., 173, 173n15, n17, 174, 174n18
 Lausberg, H., 137n26, 141n41
 Lefkowitz, M.R., 15n50, 80n17, 175n20, 179n33, 180n36
 Lietzmann, H., 230n34
 Lightman, M., 352n59
 Llewellyn-Jones, L., 171n8
 Lloyd, G., 6m19
 Lloyd-Jones, H., 88n44
 Loven, L.L., 196n93
 Lovering, E.H., 226n14, 229n29, 230, 230n34, n35, 231, 231n37, 232n45
 Lovibond, S., 6m19
 Lutz, C.E., 10n35, 204m10
- MacDonald, D.R., 223n5, 268n36
 MacDonald, M.Y., 22n75, 177n26, 184n50, 194n86, 221n1, 241n67, 284n88, 301n41, 308n53, 312n66, 313n71, 319n82, n83, 353n65, 357n78, 360n85, 388n22
 Malherbe, A.J., 15n50, 18n59, 23, 24, 57n104, 59n113, 86n38, 120n167, 121n168, 124n177, 125n180, 130n3, n4, 131n5, 133, 133n11, 134n13, 139n35, 177n26, 204, 205, 205n11, 207, 207n21, 208n22, 291n2, 295n21, 340n27
 Marshall, I.H., 18n59, 21n70, 224, 224n7, 234n50, 234n51, 235n51, 236n55, 237n58, 238n60, 239n60, 242n68, 246n84, 247n86, 251n100, 291n2, 301n41
 Martin, D.B., 178n28
 Martin, S.C., 223n5, 225n10, 227, 233n49, 236n55, 251n100
 Martinez, D.G., 225n11
 McDonald, L.M., 226n14, 227n19, 227n21, 228n22
 Ménage, G., 32n2, 78, 78n5, 81n21
 Merz, A., 59n114, 216, 216n2, 225n9, 228n24, 232, 232n42, n45, 233n48, 247n86, 248n87, 249n89, 262n12, 263, 263n13, n15, 264n17, n19, 265n20, 280n74, 281n78, 282n80, 300n37-40, 311n64, 313n70, 320n85, 341n32, 345n42, n45, 346n48, 352n61, 355, 384n3, 385n5
 Metzger, B.M., 392n51, n52
 Meunier, M., 15n50, 22n75, 79n12
 Miller, J.D., 225n10
 Milnor, K., 197n93, 199n102, 200n102, 213, 213n40
 Mingana, A., 109n123

- Mitchell, M.M., 18n59, 46, 46n66, 130n3, 131n7, 132n8, 154n88, 217n2, n4, 223n5, 228n24, 233, 233n47, 237n57, 264n19, 268n31, 280n74, 281n74, 291n2, 309n57, 310, 310n60, 320n85, 356n73
- Monaco, D.G., 113, 113n142–144
- Mott, S.C., 18n59
- Moule, C.F.D., 234n50
- Mounce, W.D., 234n50
- Murnaghan, S., 194n86
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., 223n6, 225n10
- Nagy, B., 97n79
- Nails, D., 17n57, 83n28, 289n1
- North, H., 88n48, 161n124, 162n126, 169n2, 186n59, 196n93, 203, 203n6, 204, 204n8, 205, 210, 211n35, 267n28, 329, 330n2, 354n69
- Nussbaum, M.C., 10, 211n34
- Økland, J., 243, 246n83
- Olson, K., 171n8, 345n41
- O'Neil, E.N., 54n95, 98n83, 111n134, 112
- Orelli, C., 66n175
- Osiek, C., 19n62, 21n70, 22, 22n75, 68n198, 80n17, 177n26, 184n50, 194n86, 241n67, 265n20, 308n53, 312n66, 313n71, 319n82, n83, 353n65, 357n78, 358n65
- Parkin, T., 314n72, 315n74, 322, 322n90, n92
- Pellikaan-Engel, M., 3n11
- Penny, D.N., 217n3
- Pestman, P.W., 175n20, 179n32, n33
- Plant, I.M., 15, 36n24, 57n104, 62n139, 69n209, n211, 83n28, 97n79, 112n141, 114n146, 115n151
- Pomeroy, A.J., 101n94
- Pomeroy, S.B., 7n24, 8n25, 10n39, 15n50, 17n57, 23n77, 68n198, 78, 80, 80n17, 81, 81n18, n20, 86, 89n50, 90n53, 97n79, 100n91, 210n32
- Popkes, W., 291n2
- Possekel, U., 109n123, n124, 113n142, n143, 114n145
- Pratt, L., 179n32, 322n90
- Prior, M., 223n6, 225n10, 234n50, 236n55, 237n57, 251n100
- Quinn, J.D., 18n59, 21n70, 22n75, 218n5, 23n5, 227, 227n18, 228n24, 228n25, 233n49, 234n51, 235n52, 236n55, 247n86, 250, 250n93, 265n20, 266, 266n22, 267n29, 291n2, 301n41, 302n43, 330n2, 331, 331n5, 338n22, 339, 339n25, 354n69, n70, 357, 357n80, 391n47, n48, 392n48, nn50–52
- Reynolds, L.D., 34n15
- Riedweg, C., 36n25, 105n110
- Robbins, G.R., 228n22
- Rosenmeyer, P.A., 37n29, 47–49, 50n81, 53, 77n2, 78n3, 118n160, 126n185, 127n187, 176n25, 249, 254n110
- Rothschild, C.K., 228n22
- Russell, D., 189n67, 346n47, 353n66
- Sachau, E., 113n142
- Saller, R.P., 177n26, 178n30, 198n98, n99, 313n71
- Scheinberg, S., 85n34, n35, n37
- Schleiermacher, F., 222n4
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E., 20, 20n66
- Scott, J.W., 17n58
- Sebasta, J.L., 345n41
- Smith, C.A., 225n10, 236n55, 239n60, 251n100
- Smyth, H.W., 61n123, 64n158, n160, 69n211, 72n238, 157n104, 182n44, 268n34, 385n4, 388n17, 391n48
- Spender, D., 116n154
- Spicq, C., 21n70, 22n75, 234n50, 236n55, 237n57, 266n21, 330n2, 338n22, 354, 354n69, 391n47, 392n48
- Städele, A., 16n55, 31, 32n5, 33n12, 34n13, n16, 35n22, n24, 36n25, 37, 37n29, 38n31, 41, 42n47, nn49–52, 50n80, 57, 58, 59n107, n108, n113, n114, 60n115, n116, nn119–122, 61n123, n128, 62n132, n133, n136, n138, n139, 63n141–144, n147, n148, 64n151, n158, 65n167, n174, 66n175–177, nn179–183, 67n189, n192, 69n202, n204, n208, n209, n210, 70n213, n215, n217, 71n227, n228, n235, 73n257, 74n261, n266, n268, n269, 75n273, 78n4, 79, 80, 80n15, 84n32, 85, 86n38, 91n57, 92, 93n68, 95n74, 96n77, 114n146, 147n66, 149n73, 167n144, 170n5, 172n9, 179n34, 182n41, 346n47, 377
- Stowers, S.K., 19n163, 120n167, 130n4, 133n11–13, 137, n13, 140n36, n38, n39, 141, 141n39, n43, 142, 142n47, 143, 144, 144n56, n58, 145n61, 309n57
- Sundberg, A.C., 228n22
- Taylor, J.E., 15, 16, 17n57, 24, 44n57, 117n156, 172n9
- Taylor, T., 14n47

- Thesleff, H., 12n42, 13nn45–47, 14n47, n48,
32n2, 34n19, 36n24, 41, 41n45, 43n53,
44n58, 49n75, 57n103, 58, 62n137, 64n159,
69n208–210, 74n268, 78n4, n9, 81n21,
92n59, 96n79, 98n82, 100n92, 115n150,
207n21
- Thom, J.C., 11n42, 75n280, 167n144, 185n56,
190n72, 202, 202n3, 203, 344n39
- Thompson, C.L., 345n41
- Thompson, M., 229n28
- Thurston, B.B., 312n66
- Towner, P.H., 18n59, 20n64, 21n70, 22n75,
223n6, 228n25, n27, 229, 229n29, n33,
235n51, 236n55, 237n57, 238n59, 239n60,
242n68, 247n86, 250n91, 251n100,
252n102, 291n2, 301n41, 321n86
- Trible, P., 19n62
- Trobisch, D., 226, 226n13, n14, 227, 227n16,
230n34
- Trummer, P., 217n2
- Tulloch, J.H., 338n23
- Van Bremen, R., 212n38, 282n80, 362n86
- Van Geytenbeek, A.C., 206n15
- Van Neste, R., 225n10, 236n54
- Verner, D.C., 18n59, 22n75, 223n5, 243n72,
287, 287n91, 291n2, 312, 313, 322n89,
336n17, 357
- Wacker, W.C., 18n59, 22n75
- Wagener, U., 18n59, 24, 223n5, 241n66,
247n86, 249n89, 262n12, 263n16, n17,
264n18, n19, 272n45, 280, 280n70, n71,
n74, 281n75, n76, n78, 282, 282nn80–
83, 283n85, 284, 284n88, 300n37, n38,
311n64, 313n70, 314n72, n73, 316n75,
326n98, 329, 336n17, 337, 337n20, 338n21,
339, 339n25, 345n42, n45, 352, 352n59,
353, 354n68, 355n73, n74, 384n3, 385n5,
388n22, n24
- Waithe, M.E., 3n10, 15n50, 17n57, 36n24,
41n44, 51n83, 54n98, 57, 57n103, n104, 58,
58n105, 69n209, 81, 81n21, 82, 82n22, n24,
83, 83n28, 97n79, 112n141, n15, n17, 117n157,
126n186
- Ward, J.K., 3n10, 83n28, 97n79
- Wider, K., 3n10, 17n57
- Wiedemann, T., 177n26, 179n30
- Wilhelm, F., 80n14
- Wilson, N.G., 34n15
- Winter, B.W., 17n57, 21n70, 23, 23n76, n77,
57n104, 59n113, 68n198, 174n20, 301n41,
330n2, 332n7, 353n67, 388n22, 392n48
- Wire, A.C., 341n33
- Wolf, J.C., 32n2, 36n24
- Wyke, M., 171n8
- Young, F.M., 18n59, 19, 22, 22n75, 218n5,
223n5, 260, 273n50, 275n54, 289n1,
321n88, 322n89
- Young, I., 171n8
- Zuntz, G., 230n34
- Zweisel, W., 352n59

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Adam, 240, 259, 263–264, 286, 311, 347, 348, 351
- Adornment, women's, 24, 129, 160–161, 170–172, 175, 204, 205, 206, 208, 331, 334, 343–348, 362–363, 371–372
- Advantage, appeal to, 154–155, 158, 192–193
- Anger, 62, 68, 73, 74, 75, 113, 123, 137, 157, 162, 165, 169, 183, 184, 191, 198
- Anna, 314
- Antitheses (see also: examples [immoral and moral], vices and virtues, warnings and promises) 140–141, 152, 163–164, 201, 290, 295–296, 303, 310, 327, 365, 370
- Apphia, 226, 243
- Arete, 92, 102, 119, 134, 186
- Aristippus, 92, 97, 119, 134, 186
- Asceticism, 218, 240–241, 341–343, 352
- Aspasia, 8, 92, 102
- Audience
for Pastoral letters, 216, 218, 232, 250–251, 254–255, 258, 262, 270–271, 287, 290, 312, 327, 329, 363–364
for Pythagorean letters, 52–56
- Bees, 9, 77, 84–90, 121, 176, 195
- Bishop (*episkopos*), 262, 273, 284, 292, 302, 306–307, 315, 316, 330, 333, 334, 335–336, 338, 349, 350, 355
- Blush/blushing, 61, 72, 156, 159, 172–174, 338
- Caricature, 137
- Celibacy, 204, 219, 221, 335, 341–343
- Child-bearing, 207–208, 210, 286, 302, 312, 320, 324, 331, 335, 337, 344, 347, 355
- Child-minders, 188
- Child-rearing, 12–14, 64, 138–153, 177–186, 186–190, 205, 209, 212, 312, 319–320, 324, 335, 355, 371
- Chreia, 32, 54, 98–99, 102–104, 105–106, 110–112, 114, 127, 190, 202
- Church leadership/office, 218, 219, 254, 272–274, 306, 336, 354
of men, 242–243, 262, 306, 327, 335–336, 355, 364
of women, 221, 265, 306, 312–313
- Claudia, 259, 318, 320–321, 325, 356, 360
- Clement of Alexandria, 91, 103
- Clothing, 17, 21, 40, 51, 60–61, 64, 86, 89, 99, 103, 130, 132, 143, 151–152, 159, 171–173, 174, 175, 183, 185, 194, 196–197, 200, 208, 245, 331, 334, 337, 344–348, 362, 385
- Codex manuscripts (containing Pythagorean letters), 32–38, 39–41
- Corpus Paulinum* (see Letter collection Pauline)
- Cosmetics, 171–173, 208, 345
- Crates, 10–11, 33, 120, 121, 125, 134, 348
- Crete, 23, 85, 218, 231, 238, 278, 302
- Curriculum, 25–27, 30, 365
- Deacon
female (?), 306, 308–309, 310, 336, 356
male, 244, 254, 266, 273, 274, 284, 306–307, 308–309, 315, 335–337, 386
- Despoina* (see Slaveholders, female)
- Diatribes, 137, 140–153, 155, 163–164, 292
censure/indictment, 133, 142, 143–145, 155–157, 292, 369, 391
imperatives, 143
rhetorical questions, 133, 143–145, 155–157
vocative address, 133, 141–142, 143, 155–156
- Dikaiosynē*, 196–197, 199, 211, 376
- Diotogenes, 13, 14, 44, 150, 151
- Divorce, 72, 157–158, 163, 221, 240, 313, 314, 325–326, 352–353
- Doric Greek/Doricisms, 34, 36, 37–38, 39–41, 44, 45, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 78, 84, 92, 104, 124, 129, 185, 190, 206, 366, 367
- Drunkenness, 135, 136, 182, 267, 303, 306–308, 322, 323, 324, 332, 333
- Education, Greco-Roman, 22, 25, 26, 53–54, 91, 103, 133–134, 140, 164, 169, 212, 255, 369
of women, 10, 22, 54–55
of men, 25, 55
- Elders (church office), 238, 254, 262, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 284, 306–307, 322, 336, 349, 350, 355
- Ephesus, 23, 85, 218, 230, 231, 238, 247, 251

- Esther, 102
 Euboulē, 96
 Eunice, 259, 318–320, 325, 356, 363, 371, 372
 Euodia, 20, 243, 246, 318
 Eurydike, 99, 125
 Eve, 219, 240, 259, 263–264, 282, 285–286, 305, 311–312, 323, 324, 347, 348, 351–352, 356, 360, 370, 372
 Examples (see also Teachers, as examples, and, Paul, as example)
 for imitation, 75, 114, 127, 133, 160, 164, 177, 202, 212, 323–324
 immoral and moral, 138, 142, 143, 148–152, 157, 201, 212, 220, 290, 295, 309–324, 327, 370
 Exhortation, 260–261, 289, 302

 Fidelity, marital, 129, 176, 178, 180, 190, 190–193, 205, 206, 209, 211, 240–241, 329, 330, 342, 347, 351, 352–356, 359, 371, 373
 Flattery, 148, 151, 159, 186–187, 189
 Fly, 94–95

 Gender, ancient constructions of, 1–17, 375
 femininity, 15–16, 56, 159, 343
 masculinity, 56, 67, 138, 146, 150–153, 189, 202, 240, 323–324, 343
 Good works, 300, 307, 315–317, 320, 345–347, 349, 350, 358, 362, 392
 Gossip, 170, 266, 279, 282, 305, 322, 346

 Hairstyles, 17, 21, 171, 245, 331, 344, 347, 348
Harmonia, 43, 51, 190
Hetaraí, 8, 35, 37, 51, 57, 60, 68, 70, 72, 94, 123, 129, 132, 143, 153–164, 171–172, 190–192, 210, 212, 240, 324, 370
 Hierocles, 10, 14, 154
 Hipparchia, 10–11, 102, 120, 121
 History of effects, of Pastoral letters, 19–20, 374–376
 Holiness, 339–342
 House-church, 18, 287, 317, 336, 360, 367, 372, 373
 Household ethics/management, 11–14, 54, 129, 164–167, 170, 194–200, 205, 347, 363
 “Household of God”, 18, 243, 249, 257, 260, 265, 273–275, 287, 303, 317, 324, 336, 359, 361, 367, 371
 Household roles/relationships, 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, 219, 243, 304, 309, 321, 335–337, 349, 373
 of men, 6–8, 12–14, 71, 177–178, 194, 199–200, 264, 338, 350
 of women, 2, 6–7, 10–15, 19, 21, 37, 44–45, 51–52, 54–56, 71, 88, 169–170, 194, 199–200, 212, 220, 243, 265, 274, 285, 302, 305, 318, 326–327, 343, 347, 349, 350, 358–359, 361, 371–373
 Husband, 70–73, 106, 153–164, 169–176, 326, 340, 348, 350, 354–355, 364
 extramarital sex, 190–192, 210

 Imitation (see Example [for imitation], Paul [as example], and Teachers [as examples])
 Intertextuality, 217, 232–233, 249, 313

 Jealousy, 68, 132, 145, 156–157, 160, 162, 163, 165, 166, 175, 192, 198
 Jewelry, 21, 171–172, 174–175, 208, 331, 338, 344–345, 347, 348
 Judith, 102
 Junia, 20, 243, 244

 Kallisto, 96
Koinonia/marital partnership, 70, 153–164, 192–193, 195, 207–208, 369
 Kleareta, 84
Kyria (see Slaveholders, female)

 Learners in the Pastorals
 female, 278–284, 302, 368
 male, 275–278
 Letter
 genre, 119, 121, 129
 handbooks, 131–132, 139–140
 as educational strategy, 119–125, 169
 censorious, 138–153, 153–164, 324–325, 369–370
 paraenetic, 123, 129–134, 135–138, 140, 164–167, 216, 220, 291–292, 310, 324, 326, 369–370
 philophronetic, 129, 133, 135, 138, 164–167
 philosophical, 30, 31, 45, 114, 119–125, 140, 153, 169, 222, 259–260
 Letter collection (see also, Reading strategies), 30, 201, 366–367
 Pastoral, 216, 217, 221–256, 259, 366
 Pauline, 216, 221, 225–248, 260, 289, 290, 342, 367
 Pythagorean, 31–43, 45, 56, 118–119, 122, 212, 233, 254, 366
 Lois, 259, 318–320, 323, 325, 356, 363, 371, 372

- Love
 husband for wife, 70, 71, 88, 158, 193
 mother for child, 71, 143, 146, 148–149, 163, 169, 180, 186, 189, 192, 244, 264, 320, 332, 335, 338, 354
 of pleasure, 143, 149–150, 186, 304, 343
 wife for husband, 69, 71, 88, 153–156, 158, 169, 170, 193, 244, 264, 332, 338, 354
- Lydia, 318
- Macrina, 42
- Marriage (see also fidelity, marital), 153–164, 177–178, 207–208, 211, 219, 221, 240–241, 255, 324, 338, 340–341, 371
- Medea, 73, 157, 161–163, 324, 370
- Melissa (see Bee)
- Men
 old/older, 306–307, 333–334, 337, 339
 young/younger, 306–307, 333–334, 337
- Moral philosophy, Greco-Roman, 1–17, 26–27, 73, 167–168, 176–177, 187, 190–192, 201–205, 213, 216, 220, 254, 289, 355, 365
- Myia (see also, Fly), 348, 374
- Neopythagoreanism, 11–12, 43–44, 81, 85, 86, 97, 104, 150, 185, 190, 193, 200, 351, 366
- Nikostratē, 96
- Oikonomia* (see household ethics/management)
- Opponents/opposition in the Pastorals, 218, 219, 235, 238–240, 251, 259, 261, 267, 270, 273, 276–277, 283, 286, 288, 290, 292, 293, 297, 298–299, 302–304, 307, 308, 316, 323, 325, 333, 338, 343, 352, 362, 363, 370, 373, 355, 388
- Oral reading, 47, 49, 52–53, 201, 253, 255–256, 287
- Oral teaching, 114, 119, 140, 201, 260, 271
- Paideia* (see Education, Greco-Roman)
- Papyrus Hauriensis* II.13, 38–41, 42, 52, 54, 57, 60, 96, 175, 233, 366
- Paraenesis, 115, 130–135, 137, 138, 141, 160, 164–168, 170, 172, 176, 198, 201, 210, 220, 276, 278, 289, 324, 326, 365, 368–369
- Partnership, marital (see *koinonia*)
- Paul, 240–241, 243–246, 250, 252, 257–258
 as example, 216, 267–270, 274, 292, 310
 as teacher, 258–262, 265, 275, 285, 288, 298, 365
- Pauline triad, 331, 333, 336, 339, 342–343, 363, 372
- Phoebe, 20, 243, 244, 246, 308, 318
- Phyllis, 91
- Physiognomics, 323–324
- Pleasures, 123, 138, 143, 144, 146, 147, 150, 162
- Prisca/Priscilla, 20, 243, 244, 246, 259, 318, 320–321, 325, 356
- Procreation (see Childbearing)
- Pseudepigraphy
 Pastorals, 216, 217, 221–248, 257–259, 270, 284, 292, 366
 Pythagorean letters, 77–127, 169, 212, 366–367
- Pythagoras, 11–14, 36, 91–93, 97–98, 101, 104–110, 112, 115, 125, 193
- Pythagoreanism, early, 36, 43–44, 78, 105, 108, 109, 118, 185
 women in Pythagorean communities, 44–45, 84, 91–93, 104, 121
- Reading strategies, 46–52, 58, 77–78, 117, 126–127, 175–176, 201, 213, 248–255, 367
- Rebuke/rebuking, 260–261, 272, 277, 290, 292, 293, 365, 370
- Rhetoric, 201, 206, 220, 300
 deliberative, 131–132, 146, 155, 206, 310
 proofs, 99, 114, 132, 152, 160–161, 164, 216, 296
- Salvation, 220, 244, 266, 284, 286, 297–300, 303, 312, 331, 337, 342, 355–356, 359, 372, 374, 384
- Sarah (wife of Abraham), 102, 347, 348, 374
- Sardanapallos, 66, 123, 138, 142, 149–151, 202
- Self-control, 96, 111, 172, 182, 183, 185, 186, 195, 204, 212, 304, 329, 332, 333, 343, 351
- Seneca, 46–47, 50, 116, 119, 133, 140–141, 259
- Shame, 23, 103–104, 113, 171, 173–174, 186, 286, 330, 333, 334, 337, 338, 348
- Silence/stillness, 20, 59, 158, 160–161, 170–171, 201, 204, 205, 242, 246, 262, 266–267, 276, 279–280, 282, 283, 294, 299, 331, 334, 344, 346–348, 372
- Slander, 266–267, 299, 302, 303, 304, 308, 323
- Slaveholders, 194, 255, 335, 357
 female, 2, 73–75, 89–90, 143, 164–167, 188, 194–200, 209, 294, 326, 329, 356–359, 361

- Slaves, 123, 178, 188, 219, 220, 246, 255, 281,
284, 294, 301–302, 303, 336, 357, 369
children, 181, 184
female, 2, 71, 73–75, 103, 164–167, 183–184,
194–200, 340, 358
male, 146, 147, 264
punishment, 75, 198
- Socrates, 3–5, 7–9, 89, 97, 118–120, 125–126
- Sôphrosynê*, 7, 23, 57, 73, 84, 86–87, 90, 129,
137, 138, 149, 162, 169–172, 175–176, 178,
186–187, 194–195, 203–213, 244, 264, 267,
271, 288, 294, 302, 324, 327, 329–344, 350–
351, 354–355, 358, 363–364, 374–376
- Speech
of men, 242, 267, 273, 297–299, 335, 346
of wet-nurse, 137, 182–183
of women, 21, 160–161, 170–171, 205, 242,
243, 266–267, 299, 343, 346, 371
- Stobaeus, 55–56
- Subordination, 65, 122, 124, 201, 268
of women to men, 7, 19, 20, 194, 199, 219,
244, 257–258, 262–264, 265, 274, 276,
279–282, 285, 294, 305, 327, 331, 344,
347, 348, 354, 361, 368, 371, 384, 392
- Susanna, 102
- Syntyché, 20, 243, 246, 318
- Table of Opposites*, 5–6
- Teachers
female, 50, 119, 258, 262–267, 294, 350,
368
male, 216, 257, 258–262, 288, 350, 368
as examples, 125–127, 216, 220, 257, 258,
285, 288, 294, 368
- Teaching prohibition for women (Pastorals),
257, 262–264, 272–273, 280, 283, 286, 292,
300, 307, 312, 331, 344, 349, 350
- Theano, 77, 93, 96–115, 348, 374
- Thecla, 20, 27, 221, 271, 275
- Therapeutae*, 24, 117
- Thesmophoria, 98, 102, 110–111
- Timothy, 217, 220, 229, 232, 235, 239, 246, 252,
254, 257–262, 269–271, 275–278, 285, 288,
290, 292–293, 310, 326
- Timoxena, 125, 133, 180–181
- Titus, 217, 220, 229, 232, 235, 239, 244, 246,
254, 257–262, 265, 270–272, 275–278, 285,
288, 290, 292–293, 302, 310, 326
- Topos*
“the good woman”, 88–89, 169, 186, 201–
213, 216, 220, 221, 238, 244, 246, 278,
329, 331, 338, 343–344, 348–349, 351,
355, 358, 359, 362–364, 370–373
- Univira*, 352–353
- Vices and virtues, 136–138, 142, 147–148, 157,
265, 290, 295, 303–309, 324, 327, 370
- Virtue, feminine/women’s, 13, 24–25, 52, 55,
103, 111, 113, 114, 118, 122, 127, 169, 175, 178,
180, 190, 196–197, 200, 203–204, 267, 285,
288, 359, 362–365, 368
- Warnings and promises, 138, 146, 154–155,
157–159, 201, 290, 295, 297–303, 370
- Wealth, 61, 71, 89, 113, 130, 132, 175, 209, 218,
219, 244–245, 253, 282, 284, 304, 306–307,
315, 345, 348, 349, 358, 362, 369
- Wet-nursing/wet-nurses, 58, 61, 63, 66, 135–
138, 179–186, 189, 194, 295
- Widows/widowhood, 67, 72, 102, 158, 221,
240, 245, 251, 274, 278, 282–283, 284, 298–
299, 302, 306–307, 312–318, 324, 325–326,
332, 335–336, 338, 349, 350–351, 352–354,
356, 359, 361–363, 387–389
- Wife/wives, 153–164, 169–176, 190–193, 324,
340, 348, 350–355, 359
- Women
old/older, 50, 73, 123–124, 164–165, 198,
202, 216, 219, 220, 250, 255, 265–267,
272–275, 277, 278–279, 284–285, 288,
294, 302, 306–307, 310, 321–323, 327,
331, 337, 356, 364, 370
young/younger, 50, 73, 123–124, 158, 164–
165, 195, 202, 216, 219, 220, 250, 255,
265–267, 271–275, 277, 278–279, 285,
288, 294, 302, 306–307, 315, 321–322,
326, 331, 337, 350–351, 354, 361, 364,
370
- Women’s history, 17, 20–21, 80–83, 115, 241

